92-155
NO. ____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 21 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

STATEWIDE REAPPORTIONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, et al.,

Appellants,

v.

NICK THEODORE, et al.,

Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court For The District Of South Carolina

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT AND APPENDIX VOLUME I, PAGES 1-223

LAUGHLIN MCDONALD
Counsel of Record
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Inc.
44 Forsyth Street, NW
Suite 202
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 523-2721

WILLIE ABRAMS
DENNIS COURTLAND HAYES
NAACP Special Contribution Fund
4805 Mount Hope Drive
Baltimore, Maryland 21215-3297
(410) 358-8900

JOHN ROY HARPER II
P.O. Box 843
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
(803) 771-4723

Counsel for Appellants

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court of three judges erred in failing to fully apply the standards of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and conduct a full Section 2 hearing in adopting court ordered legislative redistricting plans to remedy violations of the one person, one vote principle?

2. Whether the court erred by fragmenting concentrations of minority population and dispersing them into separate legislative districts in areas of the state where voting was racially polarized and minority voters lacked the equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, and where reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts could have been created?

3. Whether in considering if its plans complied with the Voting Rights Act, the court erred in applying a retrogression standard and comparing its plans only with the preexisting malapportioned plans, and not with plans that provided an undiluted level of minority voting strength?

4. Whether the court erred in giving greater deference to the state's policies of protecting incumbents and maintaining the integrity of county boundaries in the redistricting process than to federal policy of avoiding the unnecessary fragmentation of the black community and the dilution of minority voting strength?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The appellants are Statewide Reapportionment Advisory Committee, D. William Gibson, Bishop Frederick Calhoun James, Rev. Herbert Williams, Willie B. Owens, and South Carolina State Conference of the NAACP Branches. Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, is the cross-appellant. The appellees are Nick Theodore, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, Robert J. Sheheen, Speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and James B. Ellisor, Executive Director of the South Carolina State Election Commission. Katharine I. Butler was amicus curiae in the court below.

In the consolidated case of *Burton v. Sheheen*, C.A. No. 3:91-2983-1, the plaintiffs were Michael G. Burton, William P. Collins, III, Earl Copeland, William Patrick Flack, Frank E. Gibson, III, Nancy D. Hawk, and Gus Roberts. Kimberly T. Burch was a plaintiff-intervenor. The defendants were Robert J. Sheheen, Nick Theodore, James B. Ellisor, and Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. The defendant-intervenors were Robin Tallon, Neil A. Vander Linden, Forrest E. Ott, Philip T. Jones, Ann Y. Hart, Peggy A. Dufek, Gwendolyn L. Grooms, the South Carolina Senate, and the Democratic Party of South Carolina. Katharine I. Butler was amicus curiae.

In the consolidated case of *Blanton v. Campbell*, C.A. No. 3:91-3635-1, the plaintiffs were Bufort Blanton, Neil A. Vander Linden, Forrest E. Ott, Ann Y. Hart, Peggy A. Dufek, and Vincent Johnson. The defendants were Carroll A. Campbell, Jr., Nick Theodore, Robert J. Sheheen, James B. Ellisor, Dorchester County Legislative Delegation, State of South Carolina, Sherry Martschink,

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING – Continued

Stephen E. Gonzales, Annette Young, Sandra S. Wofford, George H. Bailey, John W. Matthews, Jr., Michael T. Rose, and the South Carolina Senate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Parties to the Proceeding ii

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 1

Constitutional Provisions and Rules 2

Statement of the Case 2

The Questions are Substantial 17

Conclusion 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES:

Allen v. State Board of Elections, 393 U.S. 544 (1969) 22

Beer v. United States, 425 U.S. 130 (1976) 18

Blanton v. Campbell, C.A. No. 2:91-3635-1 (D.S.C.) 4

Burton v. Sheheen, C.A. No. 3:91-2983-1 (D.S.C.) 3, 4, 5, 7

Carstens v. Lamm, 543 F.Supp. 68 (D.Colo. 1982) 9

Chapman v. Meier, 420 U.S. 1 (1975) 24

Connor v. Finch, 431 U.S. 407 (1977) 24, 28

Dillard v. Crenshaw County, 831 F.2d 246 (11th Cir. 1987) 24

Edge v. Sumter County School District, 775 F.2d 1509 (11th Cir. 1985) 24

Gingles v. Edmisten, 590 F.Supp. 345 (E.D.N.C. 1984) 21

Graham v. South Carolina, C.A. No: 3:84-1430-15 (D.S.C. July 31, 1984) 4

Hastert v. State Board of Elections, 777 F.Supp. 634 (N.D.Ill. 1991) 24

In re Illinois Congressional Districts Reapportionment Cases, No. 82-C 3915 (N.D. Ill. 1981) 21, 22

Jackson v. Edgefield County, South Carolina School District, 650 F.Supp. 1176 (D.S.C. 1986) 8

Jordan v. Winter, 541 F.Supp. 1135 (N.D.Miss. 1982) 23, 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Kirksey v. Board of Supervisors, 554 F.2d 139 (5th Cir. 1977) 21, 22

McDaniel v. Sanchez, 452 U.S. 130 (1981) 9

Reaves v. City Council of Mullins, Civ. No. 4:85-1533-2 (D.S.C. Aug. 5, 1988) 8

Roman v. Sincock, 377 U.S. 695 (1964) 24

Ryan v. Otto, 454 U.S. 1130 (1982) 24

S.C. State Conference of Branches of the N.A.A.C.P. v. Riley, 533 F.Supp. 1178 (D.S.C. 1982) 21

Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986) 4

United Jewish Organizations of Williamsburg, Inc. v. Carey, 430 U.S. 144 (1977) ..... *passim*

United States v. Board of Supervisors of Warren County, Mississippi, 429 U.S. 643 (1977) 21

United States v. Dallas County Commission, 850 F.2d 1433 (11th Cir. 1988) 23

Upham v. Seamon, 456 U.S. 37 (1982) 24

White v. Weiser, 412 U.S. 783 (1973) 24, 28

Wilkes County, Georgia v. United States, 450 F.Supp. 1171 (D.D.C. 1978) 28

Winter v. Brooks, 461 U.S. 921 (1983) 18

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:

Constitution of the United States

First Amendment 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

Thirteenth Amendment 2

Fourteenth Amendment 2

Fifteenth Amendment 2

Article I, Section 2 ..... 2, 8

Constitution of South Carolina

Article III, Section 3 2

STATUTORY PROVISIONS:

28 U.S.C. §1253 2

28 U.S.C. §2284(a) 3

42 U.S.C. §1973 ..... 2, 17

42 U.S.C. §1973(b) 19

42 U.S.C. §1973c 2, 3, 9

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

Brace, Grofman, Handley & Niemi, "Minority Voting Equality: The 65 Percent Rule in Theory and Practice," 10 Law & Pol'y 43 (1988) S.Rep. No. 417, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. (1982) 26

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

STATEWIDE REAPPORTIONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, et al.,

Appellants,

v.

NICK THEODORE, et al.,

Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court For The District Of South Carolina

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Opinions Below

The May 1, 1992 opinion of the three judge court for the District of South Carolina redistricting congressional and legislative districts in South Carolina, which appears in the appendix hereto, App. 1, *infra*, is unreported. The May 15, 1992 judgment of the three judge court, which appears in the appendix hereto, App. 464, *infra*, is unreported.

Jurisdiction

The order and judgment of the three judge court for the District of South Carolina were entered on May 1,

1992 and May 15, 1992 respectively. Appellants filed their notice of appeal on May 22, 1992. *See,* App. 469, *infra.*

This appeal is being docketed in this Court within 60 days after the filing of the notice of appeal in the district court. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1253.

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

The constitutional and statutory provisions involved in the case are the First, Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §§1973 and 1973c, and Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution of South Carolina, the pertinent texts of which are set out in the appendix hereto, App. 478-485, *infra.*

Statement of the Case

Appellants are black, or African-American, residents of South Carolina, the Statewide Reapportionment Advisory Committee, an unincorporated association of private individuals and organizations in South Carolina, and the South Carolina State Conference of NAACP Branches (hereinafter referred to collectively as "SRAC"). They brought this action (the "*SRAC*" case) on October 31, 1991 alleging that the existing congressional and legislative districts in South Carolina based upon the 1980 Census were malapportioned in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and diluted minority voting strength in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1973.[1] They requested the district

---

[1] SRAC also contended that the actions of the state violated their rights protected by the First, Thirteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, and Article III, Section 3 of the Constitution of South Carolina.

court to order interim court ordered redistricting on the ground that the South Carolina General Assembly and the Governor had failed during the 1991 legislative session to redistrict the state's congressional and legislative districts following the 1990 Census,[2] and that there was not enough time prior to the 1992 elections for the state to redistrict and comply with the preclearance provisions of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1973c. A three judge court was constituted to hear the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2284.[3]

The appellees are the Lieutenant Governor, who is President of the Senate, *ex officio*, the Speaker of the House, and the Executive Director of the State Election Commission, who has general supervisory authority over elections in the state. The Governor, a defendant below, is cross-appellant.

A similar case, *Burton v. Sheheen*, C.A. No. 3:91-2983-1 (D.S.C.) (the "*Burton*" case), had been filed on October 4, 1991, by the Republican Party.[4] *Burton* and this action were consolidated for trial on November 13, 1991. The

---

[2] The Senate and House passed redistricting plans for their respective bodies but neither was able to approve the plan passed by the other before adjournment *sine die*. A concurrent resolution to extend the session failed, and the Governor declined to call a special session to consider redistricting.

[3] 28 U.S.C. §2284(a) provides:

> A district court of three judges shall be convened when otherwise required by Act of Congress, or when an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts or the apportionment of any statewide body.

[4] On October 23, 1992 Congressman Robin A. Tallon moved to intervene as a plaintiff in *Burton*, and on October 28, 1991 Neil A. Vander Linden, et al. moved to intervene as defendants. On October 31, 1991 the South Carolina Senate also moved to intervene as a defendant. Joinder of the additional parties was ordered on November 13, 1991.

Democratic Party of South Carolina and Kimberly Burch moved to intervene in *Burton/SRAC*, and intervention was granted, although Burch was ultimately dismissed by consent of the parties.[5]

The General Assembly reconvened on January 14, 1992 and adopted redistricting plans for the Senate and House. The Governor vetoed the plans on January 29, 1992 on the ground that they did not comply with Section 2, and the vetoes were sustained. The Senate and House passed separate bills for congressional redistricting but no plan was enacted by the General Assembly.

After the Governor's veto was sustained, the parties agreed that the legislative process was deadlocked. The cases were set for trial beginning on February 18, 1992.

The Senate was last redistricted by the General Assembly in 1984, after a three judge panel ordered into effect an interim court ordered plan. *Graham v. South Carolina*, Civil Action No: 3:84-1430-15 (D.S.C. July 31, 1984). The House was redistricted in 1981 without judicial intervention. The state's congressional districts were last drawn in March, 1982 by a three judge court. *S.C. State Conference of Branches of the N.A.A.C.P. v. Riley*, 533 F.Supp. 1178, 1183 (D.S.C. 1982). The General Assembly never

---

[5] On December 12, 1991, Bufort Blanton, et al. filed suit, *Blanton v. Campbell*, C.A. No. 2:91-3635-1 (D.S.C.) (the "*Blanton*" case) against the state officials named in *Burton/SRAC*, as well as various members of the General Assembly, alleging that the county legislative delegation system was unconstitutional. *Blanton* was consolidated with *Burton/SRAC* on January 14, 1992. Prior to trial, *Blanton* was bifurcated on the grounds that the issue of the constitutionality of the delegation system was not appropriate for consideration by a three judge court, and that resolution of the issues in *Blanton* would depend upon how, if at all, the court ordered plans affected county lines. None of the issues raised in *Blanton* are before this Court or involved in this appeal.

enacted a congressional plan of its own, and as a consequence the court ordered plan became the permanent plan.

According to the 1980 Census, the population of South Carolina was 3,121,820, of which 948,623 (30.4%) were black. Blacks were 27.3% of the voting age population (hereinafter "VAP"). The 1990 Census showed that the state's population has increased to 3,486,703. While the black population increased to 1,039,884, blacks are now a slightly smaller percentage of the total population (29.8%), as well as the VAP (26.9%). p. 63. There were also significant shifts in population from 1980 to 1990, particularly from rural and urban to resort and suburban areas of the state.

Summary of the Evidence at Trial

At the beginning of trial the parties stipulated that the existing congressional and legislative plans were malapportioned. Under the 1990 Census, the Senate plan had a total deviation among districts of 63.15%, the House plan had a deviation of 113.86%, and the Congressional plan had a deviation of 8.33%. During the three week trial the parties submitted evidence and various remedial redistricting plans.

SRAC contended that any plan adopted by the court must comply with Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act and provide minorities the equal opportunity to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice. SRAC and the *Burton* plaintiffs submitted substantial evidence of the factors deemed probative of minority vote dilution identified in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 37, 45 (1986), and the Senate Report that accompanied the 1982 amendment of Section 2, to wit: (1)

that blacks were geographically compact;[6] (2) that blacks were politically cohesive; (3) that voting was racially polarized; (4) that there was a history of official discrimination in the state that touched the rights of blacks to participate in the electoral process;[7] (5) the depressed socio-economic status of minorities;[8] (6) the extent to which minorities had been elected in congressional and legislative contests;[9] and (7) the use of voting practices, such as a majority vote requirement for primary elections, that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group.

The evidence of political cohesiveness and racial bloc voting was extensive, and was unrebutted. SRAC's expert Dr. James Loewen analyzed, using standard ecological regression, 130 electoral contests (84 for county offices, 21

---

[6] SRAC's evidence of geographic compactness, which is conceded by the parties and the court, showed that congressional and legislative plans could be drawn in which blacks were a majority in one or more districts.

[7] This evidence, which was uncontested, consisted primarily of statutes and state constitutional provisions requiring racial segregation or limiting the electoral opportunities of blacks, e.g. the literacy test and poll tax, legislative resolutions calling for the maintenance of segregation, and court decisions affirming or invalidating various discriminatory practices in the state, such as segregation of schools, parks and prisons. Plaintiffs' First Request for Judicial Notice.

[8] This evidence consisted primarily of Census data which showed by virtually every socio-economic indicator – income, employment, education, housing – that blacks were a disadvantaged minority.

[9] No black has been elected to Congress and no black has won a statewide office in South Carolina in this Century, though there have been numerous serious candidates for these offices. Most of the blacks who have been elected to the state Senate and House have been elected from districts which were majority black.

for the Senate, 19 for the House, 4 for Congress and 2 for statewide office) from 1972-1984 pitting black candidates against white candidates for a single office. He concluded that voting was polarized throughout the period under investigation. Overall, whites cast about 90% of their votes for white candidates, while blacks cast about 85% of their votes for black candidates.

Dr. Theodore Arrington, an expert for the *Burton* plaintiffs, presented ecological regression analysis of more recent black/white contests (4 for the House, 2 for the Senate, one for Congress, one for solicitor, and one for Governor) from 1982-1990. He concluded, as did Dr. Loewen, that "[v]oting for national and state office in South Carolina is extremely polarized . . . [and that b]lacks are very cohesive in their voting for black candidates." Exhibit 63A. SRAC presented additional statistical analysis of polarized voting in the cities of Orangeburg and Columbia prepared by Dr. Vernon Burton. Exhibits 117, 118.

SRAC also introduced 38 Section 5 letters from the Attorney General of the United States from 1974-1992 objecting to, or commenting upon, voting changes submitted by the state and various local jurisdictions based upon findings or evidence that voting was racially polarized.[10] SRAC requested the court to take judicial notice of orders in 18 cases involving cities and counties in the state in which the courts had found racial bloc

---

[10] *E.g.*, February 14, 1980 letter commenting upon Senate redistricting and noting that "[o]ur analysis revealed a pattern of racial polarization in the voting of the white electorate and the black electorate that was so consistent as to render race the single most significant factor in predicting the outcome of such elections," and November 18, 1981 letter objecting to proposed House redistricting and finding "existing patterns of racial bloc voting in South Carolina." Exhibit 120.

voting or a violation of Section 2, or in which the defendants had consented to the abolition of an election procedure alleged to dilute minority voting strength.[11]

The two principal federal issues during the trial were the extent to which the plans proffered by the parties complied with the one person, one vote standard, and provided black voters the equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. There was no consensus among the parties as to the definition of an "opportunity" district. The court held that "a district may be considered a black opportunity district if the percentage of the black voting age population is greater than 50 percent." App. 48. SRAC contended that, based upon patterns and levels of racial bloc voting, black electoral success, district size and the presence of white incumbents, a black opportunity legislative district should ordinarily contain a minimum of approximately 57% black population.[12]

After trial, the court held that none of the plans proposed by the parties fully satisfied constitutional and statutory mandates and drew its own plans. App. 12.

---

[11] *E.g.*, Jackson v. Edgefield County, South Carolina School District, 650 F.Supp. 1176, 1198 (D.S.C. 1986) ("racially polarized voting exists in Edgefield County"), and Reaves v. City Council of Mullins, Civ. No. 4:85-1533-2 (D.S.C. Aug. 5, 1988) (finding "racially polarized voting in Mullins and the general inability of the minority-preferred candidates to win elections"). Plaintiffs' Second Request for Judicial Notice.

[12] The court did not consider the extent to which so called "influence districts" had been or could have been created, *i.e.*, those "in which the minority population is sizeable but insufficient to comprise a majority of the voting age population." App. 50. The SRAC plan similarly concentrated on creating opportunity rather than influence districts.

Standards Applied by the District Court

In adopting its plans, the court ruled that the unenacted plans offered by various state officials or bodies were not entitled to deference as "state policy," but instead "may be considered evidence of 'proffered current policy,' " citing *Carstens v. Lamm*, 543 F.Supp. 68, 79 (D.Colo. 1982). App. 17. For purposes of complying with one person, one vote in court ordered state legislative redistricting, the court adopted a *de minimis* or "approximate population equality" standard. App. 21. Court ordered congressional redistricting was held to a strict standard of population equality.

A. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act

The three judge court held that "this suit . . . is authorized under 42 U.S.C. §1973j(f) through 42 U.S.C. §1973c," App. 3, and repeatedly characterized the action as one "ari[sing] under §5 of the Voting Rights Act." App. 13, 38, 42. Although SRAC agreed that Section 5 standards were applicable to court ordered plans, and that any legislative plan implemented by the court would be subject to preclearance, *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130, 138, 148-49 (1981), SRAC never asserted that the jurisdiction of the court was based upon Section 5 nor that the action was one involving preclearance.

The court fashioned its own plans rather than adopting plans proffered by the state, and accordingly held that Section 5 preclearance was not required. However, the court held that it "must be cognizant of §5 concerns that voting changes have neither the 'purpose . . . [nor] the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote' on the basis of race." App. 25.

In determining discriminatory effect under Section 5, the court adopted a retrogression standard, *i.e.* whether there was "diminution in minority opportunity from what it had been under an earlier plan." App. 26. In

assessing diminution, or retrogression, the court compared "the gross number of districts with minority population and voting majorities in the old plan [at the time the plan was originally drawn or at the time a new plan is proposed] and the number of such districts drawn in the proposed plan." *Id.* Thereafter, where such comparisons were meaningful or possible, the court compared the black population and voting age population in individual districts under the old and new plans.

The court rejected as a basis for determining retrogression, argued for by SRAC, the comparison of the court ordered plans with options for properly apportioned districts, or plans that provided an undiluted level of minority voting strength. According to the court, such a comparison has no basis in case law, the statutes, or Section 5 regulations, and "enshrines the notion that the Voting Rights Act insures proportional representation by race." App. 30-31.

B. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

Because the court viewed this case as "a proceeding under §5," it held "that it is not obligated to completely import the standards and requirements of §2," and "decided against conducting a full §2 inquiry."[13] App. 39, 44. The court justified its action on the additional grounds that: (1) there was "lack of a clear legislative intent or judicial interpretation" for fully applying Section 2; (2) "any testimony regarding the effect of the proposed plans is sheer speculation;" (3) any attempt to completely apply Section 2 standards "would impair the duality of remedies currently afforded aggrieved parties

---

[13] The court also ruled from the bench during trial that it would not grant SRAC, or any other party, a subsequent Section 2 hearing on any plan it might adopt.

under principles of *res judicata* or separation of powers;" and, (4) "the evidentiary burden presented by a §2 challenge to each proposed plan in this case would have been staggering and would likely still be ongoing." App. 39, 42, 44.

Nonetheless, in order to "insure that the threshold requirements of a §2 action cannot be established under the adopted plan[s]," the court indicated that it considered "the extent to which reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts were and could be drawn . . . the extent to which the minority group is politically cohesive . . . [and] the extent to which racially polarized voting patterns exist." App. 45-46. A district was reasonably compact, the court held, if it allowed for "effective representation," and not whether it achieved some aesthetic absolute, such as symmetry or attractiveness. App. 53. In determining the extent of racial bloc voting, the court concluded that "the parties' stipulation that since 1984 there is evidence of racially polarized voting in South Carolina is sufficient for our analysis of the plans." App. 56.

The court also considered "the extent to which the lines which have been drawn limit the number of majority-black single-member districts in light of the expressed state policies of the State of South Carolina." App. 46. According to the court, the state policy entitled to greatest deference was "the preservation of county lines."[14] App. 62. Cutting county lines to meet population requirements was deemed "necessary;" a cut of county lines for any other purpose, including creating black opportunity

---

[14] The court stated that preservation of county lines was the "only cognizable state policy" it considered. App. 62. However, as appears from the opinion, discussed *infra*, the court in fact deferred to other state policies as well, particularly the protection of incumbents.

districts, was deemed to be an "excess" or "unnecessary" cut. App. 63.

Senate Redistricting Plans

The South Carolina Senate consists of 46 seats (single-member districts) with senators elected to serve 4 year terms. At the Senate phase of the trial, the parties presented 5 plans for consideration and adoption by the court, the SRAC plan, the Senate plan, the Lieutenant Governor's plan, the Governor's plan, and the Republican Party's plan.

The following table compares the 1984 Senate plan, the 5 proposed plans, and the court ordered plan, showing for each the total deviation among districts, and the number of majority black districts (by total population and VAP).

Senate Plans	Deviation	Dists. with Maj. Bl. POP	Dists. with Maj. Bl. VAP
1984 (1)[1]	9.96%	10	7
1984 (2)[2]	63.15%	10	9
SRAC	2.74%	14	12
Senate	3.92%	11	9
Lt. Gov.	3.85%	12	9
Gov.	.0106%	13	12
Repub.	.0145%	14	13
Court	1.95%	11	10

[1] Based upon 1980 Census.

[2] Based upon 1990 Census.

The court rejected the Senate plans proposed by the Governor and the Republican Party despite the fact that they had lower deviations because they contained more

excess county line cuts than did the court's plan.[15] According to the court, its plan was superior because "[c]learly we serve the state's policy better than the other two plans." App. 63. The SRAC plan, which had a deviation of 2.74% and was described by the court as "pushing the outer limits of the *de minimis* standard," had 101 excess cuts.[16] App. 61 n.58.

The court indicated that it must take into account "protecting constituent-representative relations," *i.e.* incumbency, in order to "act circumspectly and without taint of arbitrariness." App. 64-65. Thus, it rejected Senate plans proposed by SRAC and other parties because they pitted more incumbents against one another than did the court's plan.[17] According to the court, "there is nothing in either the Governor's plan or the Republican Party's plan to suggest even a casual observance of South Carolina's traditional and legitimate policies." App. 65.

The court held that its Senate plan was not retrogressive under Section 5 because it "contains 10 districts with voting age populations greater than 50 percent as compared to the 1984 plan which had 7 such districts and has

---

[15] The Governor's plan had 52 excess cuts, the Republican Party's plan had 56, and the court's plan 30. App. 63. As far as precinct lines are concerned, the court's plan split 49, the Governor's plan 122, the Republican Party's plan 144, and the SRAC plan 63.

[16] The court also held, giving as an example the Republican Party's proposed District 10, that the court's Senate plan served the policies of compactness, contiguity and preserving established communities of interest as well as, or better than, the other plans. App. 63. But such findings, based upon isolated examples of particular districts or features, can be made of any of the proposed plans, including the court's.

[17] The courts plan pitted no incumbents against one another, the Governor's plan 10, the Republican Party's plan 12, and the SRAC plan 14.

9 districts using the 1990 census figures." App. 67. The court also held that its plan "enhances the other majority black districts where demography and practicability allow." *Id.* The court, as noted *supra*, in determining retrogression refused to compare its plans with plans submitted by SRAC and the other parties which showed that additional reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts could have been created.[18]

The SRAC plan contained 12 districts with a black VAP majority, the Governor's plan 12, and the Republican Party's plan 13. Compared to the court ordered plan, the SRAC plan showed that three additional reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts could have been created in the Abbeville, Aiken, Anderson, Edgefield, Greenwood, McCormick and Saluda Counties area, the Cherokee, Chester, Newberry, Spartanburg, Union and York Counties area, and the Georgetown, Horry, Marion and Williamsburg Counties area. The evidence showed that voting was racially polarized in these areas, and that black voters would not have an equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice under the court ordered plan because of the fragmentation of concentrations of black population.

House Redistricting Plans

The South Carolina House consists of 124 seats (single-member districts) with representatives elected to serve 2 year terms. At the House phase of the trial, the parties presented 5 plans for consideration and adoption by the court, the SRAC plan, the House plan, the Sheheen

---

[18] The court considered other plans in discussing the possibility of further increasing the percent of black population in specific districts, see, *e.g.*, App. 68 n.67, but it never compared its plan to the plans submitted by the parties in assessing overall retrogression.

plan, the Governor's plan, and the Republican Party's plan. The following table compares the 1981 House plan, the 5 proposed plans, and the court ordered plan, showing for each the total deviation among districts, and the number of majority black districts (by total population and VAP).

House Plans	Deviation	Dists. with Maj. Bl. POP	Dists. with Maj. Bl. VAP
1981 (1)[1]	9.879	26	20
1981 (2)[2]	113.9	24	21
SRAC	1.95	32	32
House	9.99	28	20
Sheheen	1.998	29	21
Gov.	.98	35	33
Repub.	.18	36	33
Court	1.98	28	23

[1] Based upon 1980 Census.

[2] Based upon 1990 Census.

Three of the plans presented by the parties contained deviations lower than the 1.98% deviation in the court ordered plan, the SRAC plan (1.952%), the Republican Party's plan (0.18%), and the Governor's plan (0.98%). In addition, each of the 3 plans created a larger number of districts with black VAP majorities than the 23 black VAP districts in the court ordered plan, the SRAC plan (32), the Republican Party's plan (33), and the Governor's plan (33). The court rejected these plans because they: (1) did not accommodate "the state policy of recognizing county lines;"[19] (2) had the effect of "the elimination of house

[19] As in Senate redistricting, the court stressed that it gave "due deference to established state policies, particularly the state constitutional policy of preserving the integrity of county

(Continued on following page)

incumbents;"[20] and (3) were "a particular political or racial agenda" which the court was not free to impose upon the state.[21] App. 73-75.

The evidence also showed that voting was racially polarized in the areas of the state in which additional majority black districts could have been drawn, and that blacks in those areas would not have the equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice under the court ordered plan because of the fragmentation of black population.

The court held that its plan was not retrogressive for the reason that "[t]wenty-three of the districts in the court's plan contain a black voting-age population majority as opposed to the 1981 plan at present (21) or when drawn (20)." App. 72. Although the court acknowledged

---

(Continued from previous page)

boundaries." App. 71. The court's plan, however, contains 20 "excess" cuts in county boundaries; the SRAC plan contains 48, the Governor's plan 38, and the Republican Party's plan 40.

[20] According to the court, "SRAC appears to seek to eliminate incumbents because of their race." App. 74. SRAC, however, did not learn of the exact residences of incumbents until after it had prepared its plan. The Governor and the Republican Party were described as seeking to eliminate Democrats. Under the Republican Party's plan, 6 sets of Democrats, one set of Republicans, and 2 sets of mixed political pairs were pitted against each other. Under the Governor's plan, 8 sets of Democrats, one set of Republicans, and 2 sets of mixed political pairs were pitted against each other. In the SRAC plan, 8 pairs of Democrats, 5 pairs of Republicans, and 7 mixed political pairs were pitted against each other.

[21] The court said that the Governor's plan and the Republican Party's plan were drawn "without regard to any factor except skin color and possibly political affiliation." App. 76. The SRAC plan "does not attempt, to the degree of the other plans, to create proportional representation. Nonetheless, the plan suffers some of the same infirmities as the other plans." App. 78.

that the SRAC plan was not itself retrogressive, it did not compare its plan with the SRAC plan, or any other plan submitted by the parties, for purposes of assessing overall retrogression.

Congressional Plans

Despite the opposition of the Senate, the Lt. Governor, the House and the Speaker to creating additional majority black Senate and House districts, at the congressional phase of trial all of the state policymakers agreed that a majority black congressional district could and should be drawn. Although the court did not decide if under the circumstances it was *"required"* to create a majority black district, it in fact did so. App. 82. The district contains a black VAP of 57.9%.

Although the court adhered to state policy of respecting county boundaries and refused to make "excess" cuts to create majority black districts in Senate and House redistricting, in congressional redistricting it made more excess cuts than did other plans submitted by the parties, and acknowledged that a majority of the cuts (8 out of 13) "were made to enhance black population within the districts."[22] App. 84 n.78.

The Questions Are Substantial

I. The Application of Section 2 to Court Ordered Redistricting Is a Substantial Question

The extent to which a court should apply the racial fairness standards of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §1973, to court ordered redistricting is a substantial question which should be resolved by the Court.

---

[22] The Tallon plan split 7 counties, the House plan 11, the Lt. Governor's 14, the Governor's 15, the Senate's 25 and the SRAC plan 30.

The issue is one of exceptional national importance since it has the potential for affecting every jurisdiction required to redistrict. In addition, the issue presents itself with particular intensity at this time in the wake of the 1990 Census.

Stated succinctly, the three judge court was of the erroneous view that this was a case "under §5." App. 39. It did not undertake a meaningful analysis of minority vote dilution under Section 2 and *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986). Instead, it applied the Section 5 retrogression standard of *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130, 141 (1976), and compared its plans, not with plans showing undiluted minority voting strength proposed by SRAC, but with the pre-existing malapportioned plans.[23] Since the court's plans contained more majority black districts than the pre-existing plans, there was no retrogression. The main basis for the court's choice of plans was how well they maintained county lines and protected incumbents.

A. Measuring Minority Vote Dilution under Section 2

Section 2 prohibits the use of any voting procedure that "results" in a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on the basis of race. A violation of the statute may be

---

[23] Even assuming a retrogression standard were applicable, the three judge court failed to apply the ruling in Wilkes County, Georgia v. United States, 450 F.Supp. 1171, 1178 (D.D.C. 1978), *aff'd mem.*, 439 U.S. 99 (1981), that where a preexisting plan is malapportioned, "it is appropriate, in measuring the effect of the voting changes, to compare the voting changes with options for properly apportioned single-member district plans." Since the preexisting plans in this case were malapportioned, retrogression should have been measured based upon the properly apportioned single member district plans proposed by SRAC.

shown by evidence that members of a protected minority "have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." 42 U.S.C. §1973(b). In *Thornburg v. Gingles, supra,* 478 U.S. at 50-1, the Court held that the most important considerations in determining a Section 2 violation are: (1) whether the minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in one or more single member districts; (2) whether the minority is politically cohesive, *i.e.* tends to vote as a bloc; and, (3) whether the majority also votes as a bloc "usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate."[24]

While minorities have no right to proportional representation as measured by persons elected,[25] if, as *Gingles*

---

[24] Although *Gingles* involved at-large voting in multi-member legislative districts, the opinion indicates that "[i]n a different kind of case . . . plaintiffs might allege that the minority group that is sufficiently large and compact to constitute a single-member district has been split between two or more multi-member or single-member districts, with the effect of diluting the potential strength of the minority vote." 478 U.S. at 50 n.16. Such is the nature of SRAC's allegations in this case.

[25] The statute provides that "nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population." 42 U.S.C. §1973(b). According to the Senate Report, the purpose of the disclaimer was to make clear that at-large elections were not unlawful *per se,* that minorities could not establish a violation merely by showing that they had not been elected in proportion to their numbers in the population, and that minorities were not entitled to quotas for office holding. S.Rep. No. 417, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 23-4, 27, 31 (1982). The Court confirmed this interpretation of the disclaimer in Thornburg v. Gingles, supra, 478 U.S. at 46.

indicates, a redistricting plan limits the number of majority black districts, and reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts could have been drawn, and if voting is racially polarized to the extent that black voters are denied the equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, then the redistricting plan fails to comply with Section 2. *See* part II-B of the Court's opinion, 478 U.S. at 46-51 (this part of Justice Brennan's opinion was joined by Justices White, Marshall, Blackmun and Stevens).

Justice O'Connor in a concurring opinion (joined by Chief Justice Burger and Justices Powell and Rehnquist) underscored this point in her discussion of the standard against which vote dilution under Section 2 is to be measured. According to Justice O'Connor:

> Third, the court could attempt to arrive at a plan that would maximize feasible minority electoral success, and use this degree of predicted success as its measure of 'undiluted' minority voting strength . . . .
>
> The Court today has adopted a variant of the third approach, to wit, undiluted minority voting strength means the maximum feasible minority voting strength.

478 U.S. at 89. The concurring opinion continues:

> If, under a particular multimember or single-member district plan, qualified minority groups usually cannot elect the representatives they would be likely to elect under the most favorable single-member districting plan, then §2 is violated.

478 U.S. at 91.

Here, the three judge court refused to compare its plans with the more favorable plans proposed by SRAC. It thus failed to apply the standard for measuring the dilution of minority voting strength required by Section 2.

B. Congressional Approval of Majority Black Districts

Congress has expressly validated the use of majority black districts in redistricting to remedy minority vote dilution. According to the Senate Report:

> The court should exercise its traditional equitable powers to fashion the relief so that it completely remedies the prior dilution of minority voting strength and fully provides equal opportunity for minority citizens to participate and to elect candidates of their choice.

S. Rep. No. 417, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 31 (1982). Voting cases cited in the report as exemplifying this "complete remedy and full opportunity" standard were *Kirksey v. Board of Supervisors*, 554 F.2d 139 (5th Cir. 1977), and *In re Illinois Congressional Districts Reapportionment Cases*, No. 82-C 3915 (N.D. Ill. 1981), *aff'd sub nom. Ryan v. Otto*, 454 U.S. 1130 (1982).

Kirksey held that minorities were entitled to remedial plans that provided them a realistic opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, and that a district court "could not approve a plan which tended to carry forward into the future the long-lived denial of black access to the political process." *Kirksey*, 554 F.2d at 152. The court also rejected the argument that majority black districts would constitute an unlawful racial gerrymander. In reaching this conclusion the court relied on *United Jewish Organizations of Williamsburg, Inc. v. Carey*, 430 U.S. 144, 165 (1977), in which this Court held that a state may properly take race into account in reapportionment to create majority nonwhite districts as long as it does not stigmatize or fence out a racial minority or dilute its voting strength.

In re Illinois Congressional Districts Reapportionment Cases, supra, similarly approved the use of majority minority voting districts for congressional reapportionment in Illinois. *Also see, Gingles v. Edmisten*, 590 F.Supp.

345, 356-57 (E.D.N.C. 1984), *aff'd sub nom. Thornburg v. Gingles, supra,* citing both *Kirksey v. Board of Supervisor* and *In re Illinois Congressional Districts Reapportionment Cases,* and in which the district court concluded that Congress in amending Section 2 "necessarily took into account and rejected as unfounded, or assumed as outweighed, the risk that creating 'safe' black-majority single member districts would perpetuate . . . racial polarization in voting behavior."

C. The Court Erred in Refusing to Apply Section 2

The three judge court erroneously viewed this as a proceeding arising "under" Section 5 to which Section 2 was not fully applicable. Actions arising under Section 5 are of three kinds:

> First, of course, the State may institute a declaratory judgment action [for preclearance in the federal district court for the District of Columbia]. Second, an individual may bring a suit for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief [in the local federal district court], claiming that a state requirement is covered by §5, but has not been subjected to the required federal scrutiny. Third, the Attorney General may bring an injunctive action to prohibit the enforcement of a new regulation because of the State's failure to obtain approval under §5. All these suits may be viewed as being brought "under" §5.

Allen v. State Board of Elections, 393 U.S. 544, 561 (1969). This action, by contrast, did not invoke the jurisdiction of the local district court under Section 5, nor did SRAC (or the *Burton* plaintiffs) claim that any state requirement covered by Section 5 had not been subjected to the required federal scrutiny. Instead, SRAC contended that the preexisting legislative plans were malapportioned, and violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the

Constitutions of the United States and the State of South Carolina.

In an action under Section 5, the jurisdiction of the local three judge court is limited to questions of coverage, *i.e.*, whether the jurisdiction is covered by Section 5, whether the change is one affecting voting, and whether there has been preclearance. *United States v. Board of Supervisors of Warren County, Mississippi,* 429 U.S. 643, 645-46 (1977). The three judge court in this case did not limit itself to the sole issue of coverage, but its view of this action as arising under Section 5 caused it to refuse to conduct a meaningful analysis of vote dilution under Section 2. The court's error is fundamental and warrants review and correction by this Court.[26]

D. The Opinion Below Is Contrary to the Decisions of this Court and Lower Federal Courts

The three judge court erred in ignoring the prior decision of this Court that Section 2 vote dilution analysis is applicable to court ordered redistricting plans. In *Winter v. Brooks,* 461 U.S. 921 (1983), *vacating and remanding Jordan v. Winter,* 541 F.Supp. 1135 (N.D.Miss. 1982), this Court directed that a court ordered congressional redistricting plan for the State of Mississippi be returned to

---

[26] SRAC also contended that even if this were an action under Section 5, Section 2 standards would be applicable by virtue of the 1982 amendments of the Voting Rights Act. According to the Senate Report, "[i]n light of the amendment to section 2, it is intended that a section 5 objection also follow if a new voting procedure so discriminates as to violate section 2." S.Rep. No. 417, supra, at 12 n.31. If SRAC is correct that Section 2 applies by its own force to court ordered plans, it would be unnecessary to reach the issue, which has not yet been decided by this Court or the lower federal courts, whether Section 2 standards were incorporated into Section 5 by virtue of the 1982 amendments.

the district court "for further consideration in light of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965," which had been amended in August two months after the district court's June 8, 1982 decision. The failure of the district court to follow a controlling decision of this Court is ground for reversal.

The decision of the three judge court also conflicts with decisions of other federal appellate and district courts. The court of appeals in *Edge v. Sumter County School District*, 775 F.2d 1509, 1510 (11th Cir. 1985), relying upon *Jordan v. Winter, supra*, held that it was error for the district court to fail to conduct a Section 2 hearing prior to implementing a court ordered redistricting plan for the board of education of Sumter County, Georgia. According to the court of appeals:

> We agree with both the appellants and the submission of the United States as *amicus curiae* that the district court could not validly adopt a reapportionment plan without determining whether the plan complied with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §1973.

775 F.2d at 1510. *Accord, Hastert v. State Board of Elections*, 777 F.Supp. 634, 646 (N.D.Ill. 1991); *Dillard v. Crenshaw County*, 831 F.2d 246, 249 (11th Cir. 1987) (a court ordered plan to remedy a Section 2 violation "must itself conform with Section 2"); *United States v. Dallas County Commission*, 850 F.2d 1433, 1437-38 (11th Cir. 1988). This conflict among circuits warrants review.

Court ordered plans are in any event held to higher standards than legislatively adopted plans. *Chapman v. Meier*, 420 U.S. 1, 26 (1975). A court ordered plan must, among other things, be " 'free from any taint of arbitrariness or discrimination,' " *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977), *quoting Roman v. Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 710 (1964), and must meet "special standards . . . of racial fairness." *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 39 (1982). Under the circumstances, it would be anomalous and contrary to the decisions of this Court to hold that legislative plans

were subject to the full requirements of Section 2, but that court ordered plans were not.

E. The Court Improperly Refused to Consider the Extent and Level of Racial Bloc Voting

The three judge court refused to consider SRAC's extensive evidence of racial bloc voting because "we are not determining liability under §2 in this case." App. 56. Instead, the court found it "sufficient for our analysis of the plans" to rely upon "the parties stipulation that since 1984 there is evidence of racially polarized voting in South Carolina." *Id.* But without knowing the extent and level of racial bloc voting in the state, the three judge court could not reliably determine whether blacks "have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." 42 U.S.C. §1973(b); *Thornburg v. Gingles, supra,* 478 U.S. at 55-6. Neither could the three judge court reliably determine the extent to which it was required to avoid the fragmentation of concentrations of minority population and construct majority black districts, nor the percent of minority population needed in a given district to provide the equal opportunity for minorities to elect candidates of their choice.

The court held that "a district may be considered a black opportunity district if the percentage of the black voting age population is greater than 50 percent." App. 48. SRAC's analysis, unlike the court's, was based upon the evidence of racial bloc voting and the actual electoral success of black candidates. It showed that an opportunity district was one in which blacks were at minimum 57% of the population. Under SRAC's analysis, only 8 of

the court's 11 Senate districts, and 19 of the court's 23 House districts are in fact minority opportunity districts.[27]

The refusal of the court to consider the level and extent of racial bloc voting was in violation of *Gingles* and Section 2.

F. Policy Considerations Asserted by the Three Judge Court Do not Support the Decision Below

The policy considerations advanced by the three judge court to justify its refusal to conduct a meaningful Section 2 vote dilution analysis are contrary to the law and are unpersuasive. According to the court, "in the broad spectrum of the 'results' test of §2, any testimony regarding the effect of the proposed plans is sheer speculation." App. 42. This standard effectively denies federal courts the authority to shape an effective remedy for any Section 2 violation.

A similar argument was made by opponents of amended Section 2 and was rejected by Congress. Senator Hatch, for example, argued that "[u]nder the results standard, there is no . . . workable threshold question for the court . . . . There is no core value under the results test." S.Rep. No. 417, *supra*, at 96 (Additional Views of Senator Orrin G. Hatch of Utah). The Senate as a whole rejected this view, noting that there was "an extensive, reliable and reassuring track record of court decisions using the very standard which the Committee bill would codify," *Id.*, at 32, while this Court validated use of the results standard in *Thornburg v. Gingles, supra*.

---

[27] For a discussion of the percent of minority population needed to provide minorities a meaningful opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice, *see* Brace, Grofman, Handley & Niemi, "Minority Voting Equality: The 65 Percent Rule in Theory and Practice," 10 Law & Pol'y 43 (1988).

In addition, Congress mandated that Section 2 embodied a "functional," not a "speculative," view of the political process. *Id.*, at 48 n.15. Courts are not permitted simply to guess about the effect of voting practices, but are required to make an informed judgement of results based upon "a searching practical evaluation of the 'past and present reality,' " S.Rep. No. 417, *supra*, at 30, including "the totality of the circumstances," *Thornburg v. Gingles, supra*, 478 U.S. at 44 n. 8, and the factors identified in the legislative history as being probative of vote dilution. *Id.*, at 44-45. If the three judge court felt it had to speculate in this case, it was because it refused to conduct the kind of "searching practical evaluation of the 'past and present reality' " required by Congress and the decisions of this Court.

The court's claim that it would be too burdensome and time consuming to conduct a Section 2 analysis is similarly unpersuasive. While time constraints may well affect the nature and timing of remedies, judicial convenience cannot constitutionally justify the refusal to apply the full guarantees of the Voting Rights Act. A contrary conclusion would not only amount to repeal of the Act, but would undermine the rule of law.

The court's contention that "grafting the requirements of §2 into §5 . . . would impair the duality of remedies currently afforded aggrieved parties under principles of *res judicata* or separation of powers," App. 42, whatever its exact meaning, is inapplicable to the facts of this case. First, there is no Section 5 review of the court ordered plans in this case. Thus, "grafting" Section 2 into Section 5 would not impair the duality of remedies in any way. Second, since there is no Section 5 review, by refusing fully to apply Section 2 in the adoption of its plans or to hold a subsequent Section 2 hearing, the court has denied altogether, not merely "impaired," SRAC's remedies under the Voting Rights Act.

II. The Court Improperly Deferred to State Interests

The court below fragmented concentrations of minority population in areas of the state where voting was racially polarized and minorities lacked the equal opportunity to elect candidates of their choice, and where reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts could have been drawn, because it chose to honor "South Carolina's traditional and legitimate policies" of protecting incumbents, or "protecting constituent-representative relations." App. 64-65. The court also deferred to "the state policy of recognizing county lines," and refused to impose "a particular . . . racial agenda" by drawing additional majority black districts. App. 73, 75.

A court is obligated in court ordered redistricting to defer to legitimate state interests, but only where those interests do not conflict with the requirements of federal law.

> Although a court must defer to legislative judgments on reapportionment as much as possible, it is forbidden to do so when the legislative plan would not meet the special standards of population equality and racial fairness that are applicable to court-ordered plans.

Upham v. Seamon, supra, 456 U.S. at 39. *Accord, White v. Weiser,* 412 U.S. 783, 795 (1973); *Connor v. Finch, supra,* 431 U.S. at 419. By deferring to state policies of protecting incumbents and recognizing county lines, and by refusing to draw additional majority black districts where it was possible to do so to avoid the fragmentation and dilution of minority voting strength, the Court deprived SRAC of the protection of the Voting Rights Act and the decisions of this Court. Review should be granted of the lower court's decision.

Conclusion

For these reasons this Court should note probable jurisdiction of this appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

LAUGHLIN MCDONALD
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation, Inc.
44 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Suite 202
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 523-2721

DENNIS COURTLAND HAYES
WILLIE ABRAMS
NAACP Special Contribution Fund
4805 Mount Hope Drive
Baltimore, Maryland 21215-3297
(301) 358-8900

JOHN ROY HARPER, II
ID NO. 1729
P. O. Box 843
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
(803) 771-4723

Attorneys for Appellants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

District Court Order, May 1, 1992.....App. 1

Judgement In a Civil Case, May 20, 1992 .... App. 464

Notice of Appeal, May 22, 1992..... App. 469

Constitution of the United States:

First Amendment..... App. 478

Thirteenth Amendment ..... App. 478

Fourteenth Amendment..... App. 478

Fifteenth Amendment..... App. 479

Statutory Provisions:

42 U.S.C. §1973..... App. 480

42 U.S.C. §1973c..... App. 481

Constitution of South Carolina, Art. III, Sec. 3 ..... App. 484

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

MICHAEL G. BURTON, as Executive Director and on behalf of the Republican Party, *et al.*, Plaintiffs,	C.A. No. 3:91-2983-1
KIMBERLY T. BURCH, Plaintiff-Intervenor,	
vs.	
ROBERT J. SHEHEEN, in his representative capacity as Speaker of the South Carolina House of representatives, *et al.*, Defendants,	
ROBIN TALLON, NEIL A. VANDER LINDEN, FORREST E. OTT, PHILIP T. JONES, ANN Y. HART, PEGGY A. DUFEK, GWENDOLYN L. GROOMS, THE SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE, THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Defendant-Intervenors.	
KATHARINE I. BUTLER, Amicus Curiae.	

STATEWIDE REAPPORTIONMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, *et al.*, Plaintiffs, vs. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR., *et al.*, Defendants. KATHARINE I. BUTLER, Amicus Curiae.	)	C.A. No. 3:91-3310-1
BUFORT BLANTON, NEIL A. VANDER LINDEN, FORREST E. OTT, ANN Y. HART, PEGGY A. DUFEK and VINCENT JOHNSON, Plaintiffs, vs. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR., *et al.*, Defendants.	)	C.A. No. 3:91-3635-1

ORDER

(Filed May 1, 1992)

In these consolidated cases, the court is called upon to either adopt or create plans for the redistricting[1] of

---

[1] In its technical sense "reapportionment" refers to the redistribution of seats in established units of government such as the United States House of Representatives. "Redistricting" signifies line-drawing to establish new districts within these

(Continued on following page)

South Carolina's Senate, House of Representatives, and Congressional districts. Following tabulation of the 1990 decennial census, it was apparent the existing Senate, House, and Congressional plans could not be continued.[2] Although the South Carolina General Assembly passed new Senate and House plans, those plans were vetoed by the Governor, the vetoes were sustained, and no compromise was reached. The General Assembly never passed a Congressional plan. These suits were filed in an effort to break the legislative impasse.

I

BACKGROUND

This court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(4), and 2201; this suit being authorized under 42 U.S.C. § 1973j(f) through 42 U.S.C. § 1973c. The

---

(Continued from previous page)

units. *Kilgarlin v. Martin*, 252 F.Supp. 404, 410 n.1 (S.D. Tex 1966) *rev'd in part and remanded sub nom. Kilgarlin v. Hill*, 386 U.S. 120 (1967). *See* Bickerstaff, *Reapportionment by State Legislatures: A Guide for the 1980's*, 34 Sw.L.J. 607, 608 (1980).

[2] At trial, all parties stipulated the existing plans were unconstitutionally apportioned because of gross population disparities among the districts in the respective plans. *See Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964); *See also, infra*, note 13 and pages 16-23. Because the existing districts violate constitutional norms, we need not reach the question of whether or not the existing districts also violate § 2 of the Voting Rights Act as amended in 1982. 42 U.S.C. § 1973.

three-judge panel was appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a).[3]

The South Carolina General Assembly (General Assembly) consists of two bodies:[4] a Senate with forty-six (46) seats[5] and a House of Representatives with 124 seats.[6] Senators are elected to serve four-year terms,[7] while House members are elected to serve two-year

---

[3] 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a) provides:

> A district court of three judges shall be convened when otherwise required by Act of Congress, or when an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts or the apportionment of any statewide body.

On October 23, 1991, Chief United States Circuit Judge Sam J. Ervin, III, of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals issued an order appointing United States Circuit Judge Clyde H. Hamilton, of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Chief United States District Judge Falcon B. Hawkins, of the District of South Carolina, and United States District Judge G. Ross Anderson, Jr., of the District of South Carolina to the panel.

[4] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 1.

[5] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 6; S.C. Const. Art. VIII, § 3; S.C. Code Ann. §§ 4-3-10 through 4-3-530 (1976). The forty-six counties in South Carolina are: Abbeville, Aiken, Allendale, Anderson, Bamberg, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Calhoun, Charleston, Cherokee, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Edgefield, Fairfield, Florence, Georgetown, Greenville, Greenwood, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, Marion, Marlboro, McCormick, Newberry, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens, Richland, Saluda, Spartanburg, Sumter, Union, Williamsburg, and York Counties.

[6] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 3.

[7] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 6.

terms.[8] According to the Office of the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, South Carolina is entitled to six Congressional representatives.

It is primarily the responsibility of the General Assembly, subject to the approval of the Governor, to redistrict or reapportion the Senate, House, and Congressional districts. Redistricting is primarily a matter for legislative consideration and determination and judicial relief becomes appropriate only when a legislature fails to redistrict according to federal constitutional and statutory requisites in a timely fashion after having had an opportunity to do so. *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 794-95 (1973) (quoting *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 586 (1964)); U.S. Const. Art. I, § 2; 2 U.S.C. § 2(c); S.C. Const. Art. III, § 3. We do not tread unreservedly into this "political thicket";[9] rather, we proceed in the knowledge that judicial intervention in the instant case is wholly unavoidable. In fact, judicial intervention in the South Carolina redistricting process has been frequently unavoidable. In 1984, the General Assembly ultimately fulfilled its constitutional obligation and passed a Senate redistricting plan only after a three-judge panel put an interim plan in place. *Graham v. South Carolina*, Civil Action No: 3:84-1430-15 (D.S.C. July 31, 1984).[10] South Carolina's

---

[8] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 2.

[9] *Colegrove v. Green*, 328 U.S. 549, 556 (1946).

[10] *See O'Shields v. McNair*, 254 F.Supp. 708 (D.S.C. 1966)(three-judge court approved General Assembly plan for the Senate solely as an interim plan despite "grave doubts as to [its] validity under both state and federal constitutions" and approved the General Assembly's plan for the House of Representatives); *McCollum v. West*, Civil Action No. 71-1211 (D.S.C.

(Continued on following page)

Congressional districts were last drawn in March of 1982 by a three-judge panel. The General Assembly never passed its own plan; therefore, the court's plan became the state's plan. *S.C. State Conference of Branches of the N.A.A.C.P. v. Riley*, 533 F. Supp. 1178 (D.S.C. 1982). The House of Representatives was last redistricted in 1981 without judicial intervention.[11] This plan was precleared by the Department of Justice and has been used continuously since.[12]

The results of the 1990 census, issued in March 1991, showed South Carolina's population increased from 3,121,820 to 3,486,703 between 1980 and 1990. In addition to this increase, there were significant shifts in population, primarily from urban and rural areas to suburban and resort areas. Although there was, of course, no way the General Assembly could have foretold the actual results of the 1990 census, it can hardly be argued that the overarching result of the census – unconstitutional apportionment – was a surprise.[13] Both the Senate and the

---

(Continued from previous page)

filed 12/7/71)(the Court struck down the General Assembly's plan for the reapportionment of the Senate).

[11] "In respect to the reapportionment of the House of Representatives, South Carolina's General Assembly is one of those which has faithfully complied with its constitutional obligations." *O'Shields*, 254 F.Supp. at 717.

[12] South Carolina is a covered jurisdiction under the Voting Rights Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

[13] Using the 1990 census figures, the present Senate plan has a total deviation of 63.15 percent, the present House plan a total deviation of 113.86 percent, and the present Congressional plan a total deviation of 8.33 percent.

House had sophisticated computer software and highly trained operators in place when the census figures were released. In addition, both branches were politically prepared, to the extent subcommittees were appointed, to study issues exclusively related to redistricting and ultimately to fashion plans on behalf of their respective bodies.

Despite this preparation, the General Assembly was unable to pass a redistricting bill before the 1990-91 Legislative Session adjourned.[14] The Senate had passed a redistricting plan for itself (S. 1003) as did the House (H. 3834), but neither body was able to consider the plan passed by the other before adjournment *sine die*. A concurrent resolution was introduced to extend the session, but it did not receive the two-thirds majority vote required by S.C. Code Ann. § 2-1-180 (1976). The Governor could have effectively extended the session by ordering a special session, S.C. Const. Art. IV, § 19, but he did not exercise this authority.

On October 4, 1991, Michael G. Burton, on behalf of the Republican Party and other registered voters of the state, filed suit (the "*Burton*" case)[15] against the Speaker of the House, the Lt. Governor, the Governor, and the Executive Director of the Election Commission[16] alleging

---

[14] Under S.C. Code Ann. § 2-1-180, "[t]he regular session of the General Assembly shall adjourn *sine die* each year not later than 5:00 p.m. on the first Thursday in June."

[15] Civil Action No. 3:91-2983-1.

[16] Executive Director Ellisor was ultimately dismissed by agreement of the parties.

the present Senate, House, and Congressional plans were unconstitutional based on changes in population and that the plans violated 42 U.S.C. 1973c. The plaintiffs also alleged legislative impasse.

As a remedy for their claims, the plaintiffs requested that this court enjoin any future use of the existing plans and either approve the plans submitted by the plaintiffs or create new Senate, House, and Congressional plans which comport with federal constitutional and statutory requisites. In conjunction with the filing of their complaint, the plaintiffs requested a three-judge court be empaneled pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a).

On October 23, 1991, Congressman Robin A. Tallon moved to intervene as a plaintiff and on October 28, 1991, Neil A. Vander Linden, Forrest E. Ott, Philip T. Jones, Ann Y. Hart, Peggy A. Dufek, and Gwendolyn L. Grooms (the "Vander Linden" defendants) moved to intervene as defendants. On October 31, 1991, the South Carolina Senate also moved to intervene as a defendant. These motions were granted by order on November 13, 1991 under the authority of Fed.R.Civ.P. 24 and *Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. v. Peninsula Shipbuilder's Ass'n*, 646 F.2d 117 (4th Cir. 1981).

On October 31, 1991, the Statewide Reapportionment Advisory Committee and others filed a suit (the "*SRAC*" case)[17] substantially similar to the *Burton* case and moved, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 42(a), to consolidate the two cases. Consolidation was ordered November 13, 1991. The subsequent requests to intervene in the *Burton/*

---

[17] Civil Action No. 3:91-3310-1.

SRAC case by the Democratic Party of South Carolina and Kimberly Burch were also granted.[18]

On December 12, 1991, Bufort Blanton, Neil A. Vander Linden, Forrest E. Ott, Ann Y. Hart, Peggy A. Dufek, and Vincent Johnson filed suit (the *"Blanton"* case)[19] against the state government officers named in the *Burton/SRAC* case, as well as various members of the General Assembly, alleging the county legislative delegation system is constitutionally flawed.[20] The *Blanton* plaintiffs moved to consolidate their case with the *Burton/SRAC* case and consolidation was ordered January 14, 1992. It was agreed before the commencement of the instant trial that the *Blanton* case would be bifurcated from the *Burton/SRAC* case insomuch as any claims involving the constitutionality of the state's county legislative delegation system would necessarily depend upon how, if at all, the new Senate and House plans affected county lines. In addition, this court noted the causes of action raised in the Blanton case were not appropriate for consideration by a three-judge panel.[21]

---

[18] Ultimately, Burch was dismissed by consent of the parties.

[19] Civil Action No. 2:91-3635-1.

[20] In South Carolina, certain positions and vacancies on state and county commissions and boards are filled by that county's legislative delegation, which is comprised of Senate and House members who represent any part of that county. *E.g.*, S.C. Code Ann. §§ 4-27-520, 43-3-10, 50-13-70, 51-13-22 (1976).

[21] Since the court has developed our own plans for both state legislative bodies, we order that the issue of the

(Continued on following page)

Motions to dismiss and to stay the proceedings were filed by various parties throughout the pre-trial stage on grounds the controversy was not ripe.[22] Essentially the moving parties argued the Senate and House were not at an impasse with one another nor collectively with the Governor and hope remained that plans acceptable to both the General Assembly and the Governor might yet be passed.

When the session reconvened,[23] under cloud of judicial intervention, both S. 1003 and H. 3834 were passed, separately, by the General Assembly. On January 29, 1992,

---

(Continued from previous page)

constitutionality of the county delegation system in South Carolina be deconsolidated from this action and a separate trial before a single judge of the district court be conducted on that issue if the plaintiffs still intend to pursue their cause of action in light of the court's holding today. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 42(b) and in view of the changed circumstances upon which the *Blanton* plaintiffs' claim is based, such an action is conducive to expedition and judicial economy. Further, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 54 and given the impending elections, this court makes an express determination that there is no just cause for delay and expressly orders an entry of judgment as to all other claims in these consolidated actions.

[22] "Ripeness is an amorphous legal concept subject to many 'subtle pressures including the appropriateness of the issues for decision by this Court and the actual hardship to the litigants of denying them the relief sought.' " *Carstens v. Lamm*, 543 F. Supp. 68, 76 (D.Colo. 1982) (quoting *Poe v. Ullman*, 367 U.S. 497, 508 (1961)).

[23] S.C. Const. Art. III, § 9 provides "[t]he first session of the General Assembly elected under this Constitution shall convene in Columbia on the second Tuesday in January, in the year Eighteen hundred and Ninety-seven, and thereafter annually at the same time and place."

Governor Campbell vetoed both bills. His veto messages urged the Senate and House to create more minority districts in their respective bodies and urged the Senate to enhance the minority districts which had been drawn in S. 1003. The veto message went on to express, ostensibly, the Governor's desire to meet with leaders of the Senate and the House to discuss proposed changes to the two bills.[24] The Governor's vetoes were sustained. As for the Congressional redistricting plans, both the Senate and the House passed separate bills and a conference committee was formed to study the differences with an eye towards compromise; however, no Congressional redistricting plan was ever passed by the General Assembly.

All motions to dismiss or stay were either withdrawn or resolved as moot at the February 10, 1992 pre-trial conference, and the cases were set for trial to commence February 18, 1992. On the morning of the 18th, confronted with the novel circumstance of hearing testimony and receiving evidence on the redistricting of three distinct legislative bodies, the court separated the trial into three phases: the Senate phase, the House phase, and the Congressional phase to be tried in turn. Confronted further with the unusual complexity and difficulty surrounding computer generated redistricting plans and faced with the prospects of drawing and generating its own plan, the court appointed Bobby M. Bowers, Director

---

[24] Like the Senate and the House, Governor Campbell had access to sophisticated computer software and employed a trained operator; the results of which are the Governor's proposed plans for redistricting the Senate, House, and Congress discussed more fully *infra*.

of the Division of Research of Statistical Services of the State Budget and Control Board, as technical advisor to the court pursuant to the inherent discretion of the court and under the authority of *Reilly v. U.S.*, 863 F.2d 149 (1st Cir. 1988).[25]

Five plans were proposed during the Senate phase as well as the House phase. To be expedient, certain portions of testimony offered during the Senate phase were incorporated by reference into the record of the House and Congressional phases.

Trial concluded March 6, 1992. This court has considered the testimony and evidence received and concludes none of the plans proposed for the redistricting of South Carolina's Senate, House, and Congressional districts fully comports with the objectives and criteria which should be incorporated in a judicially approved plan. Consequently, the court has drawn its own plans which satisfy all relevant constitutional and statutory requisites. The plan for each body is set forth narratively, numerically, and demographically following a discussion of the law applicable to this case.

II

SECTION 5 of the VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Before discussing the individual plans proposed by the parties or the plans this court has chosen as an interim remedy, the court sets forth certain principles of

---

[25] Mr. Bowers was not appointed as an expert under Fed.R.Evid. 706 or a special master under Fed.R.Civ.P. 53.

law which guide our evaluation of the proposed plans and the choice of remedy.

When enacted in 1965, Congress intended the Voting Rights Act to "banish the blight of racial discrimination in voting"[26] by increasing the ability of racial minorities, primarily Southern blacks, to participate in the electoral process. At first, the goal of enfranchising Southern blacks was achieved through increased voter registration among minorities. Since 1965, however, the focus of the Voting Rights Act has shifted from providing minorities with equal access to the voting booth to providing minorities with an equal opportunity to elect the candidates of their choice. This shift is evident in the cases which have interpreted the Voting Rights Act and in the legislative history of the 1982 amendments to the Voting Rights Act.[27] Since this proceeding arises under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, we begin with a discussion of the law under that section.

A

Deference to State Policies

Redistricting of the South Carolina General Assembly and the South Carolina Congressional delegation is, first and foremost, a state legislative responsibility rather than a federal judicial task. *Wise v. Lipscomb*, 437 U.S. 535, 539

---

[26] *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 308 (1966), *quoted in* S. Rep. No. 97-417, 97th Cong. 2d Sess. 118 (1982) (hereinafter "Senate Report").

[27] Senate Report at 119.

(1978). Nonetheless, as noted above, the court has concluded, based on the representations of the parties and the evidence of record, that the legislative process was and is irretrievably deadlocked with respect to redistricting and that no plans could be enacted and properly precleared through the United States Department of Justice in time to hold regularly scheduled elections. It is, therefore, necessary for this court to assume the "unwelcome obligation" of devising and approving redistricting plans for the General Assembly and the Congressional delegation pending some resolution of the legislative deadlock at a later time. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977); *Wise*, 437 U.S. at 540.

Discharge of the duty thrust upon this court requires us to adhere more strictly than state legislatures to those constitutional and statutory standards governing the redistricting process. *Wise*, 437 U.S. at 540. A federal court must act "circumspectly, and in a manner 'free from any taint of arbitrariness or discrimination.' " *Finch*, 431 U.S. at 415 (quoting *Roman v. Sincock*, 377 U.S. 695, 710 (1964)).

In fashioning interim relief where state political actors have failed to produce redistricting plans, this court, in both legislative and congressional redistricting, "should follow the policies and preferences or the State, expressed in statutory and constitutional provisions or in reapportionment plans proposed by the state legislature, whenever adherence to state policy does not detract from the requirements of the Federal Constitution." *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 795 (1973); *see also Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37 (1982)(per curiam). Decisions made by "the legislature in pursuit of what are deemed important state interests . . . should not be unnecessarily put aside in the

course of fashioning relief. . . . ", *Weiser*, 412 U.S. at 796. While "[t]he remedial powers of an equity court must be adequate to the task . . . they are not unlimited." *Whitcomb v. Chavis*, 403 U.S. 124, 161 (1971).

State policy may be found in a state's constitution or in the legislative enactments of the state. S.C. Const., Art. VII, § 13, which provides "[t]he General Assembly may at any time arrange the various counties into Judicial Circuits, and into Congressional Districts . . . as it may deem wise and proper . . . ," reflects a state policy of maintaining the integrity of county boundaries in the redistricting process. *See South Carolina State Conf. of Branches of the NAACP v. Riley*, 533 F.Supp. 1178 (D.S.C. 1982); *McLure v. McElroy*, 44 S.E.2d 101, 105 (S.C. 1947). A historical analysis of the redistricting efforts of the South Carolina Senate also evidences this policy.

In 1966, in the wake of the seminal Voting Rights Act case of *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), the General Assembly was first confronted with the task of redistricting itself on the basis of population. The result was passage of a compromise plan which "divide[d] the state, *along county lines*, into 27 election districts from which fifty senators [would] be chosen." *O'Shields v. McNair*, 254 F.Supp. 708, 710 (D.S.C. 1966)(emphasis added). Thus, the Assembly was willing to enlarge the Senate to fifty members, despite a clear state constitutional proscription against such an action,[28] to avoid cutting county lines.

The Senate was next redistricted in 1972. S.C. Code Ann. § 2-1-60 (1976). There, the General Assembly made

---

[28] *See infra* note 52.

specific findings of fact and statements of policy included within its plan, the first of which reads:

> 1. It is the public policy of this State that counties, as constitutionally recognized political subdivisions of this State, shall be treated as basic units to construct election districts for the reapportionment of the Senate . . . and it is the public policy of the State that in reapportioning the Senate . . . county boundaries should not be disturbed. . . .

Thus, in the quarter century since *Reynolds* the General Assembly has consistently stated, through its plans and specific statements of policy, that among the various state policies, preserving county lines should enjoy a preeminent role in South Carolina's redistricting process. This preeminence is highly rational.[29]

As a final note, it was suggested at trial that the plans submitted by the respective legislative bodies were state policy and were entitled to deference. We need not decide this issue because none of the districting plans proffered to the court was enacted into law as state policy. *See* S.C. Const. Art. IV, § 21 (all laws require passage by General

---

[29] "Political subdivisions should remain undivided whenever possible because the sense of community derived from established governmental units tends to foster effective governmental representation. Unnecessary fragmentation of these units not only 'undermines the ability of constituencies to organize effectively but also . . . increases the likelihood of voter confusion regarding other elections based on political subdivision geographics.' " *Carstens*, 543 F.Supp. at 88 (quoting American Bar Association on Election Law and Voter Participation, *Congressional Redistricting*, at 12 (1981))

Assembly and signature of the Governor); *See also Carstens*, 543 F.Supp. at 79. Unenacted legislative or gubernatorial plans may only be considered evidence of "proffered current policy." *Id.*

B

Equality of Population and Variances

1. Congressional Plan

Redistricting plans for congressional districts are subject to stringent equal population requirements. In *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 730 (1983), the Supreme Court noted, "Article 1, § 2 [U.S. Const.] 'permits only limited population variances which are unavoidable despite a good-faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown.' " *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 730 (quoting *Kirkpatrick v. Priesler*, 394 U.S. 526, 531 (1969)). "[T]here are no *de minimis* population variations, which could be avoided, but which nonetheless meet the standard of Art. 1, § 2, without justification." *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 734.

Karcher sets forth a two-pronged inquiry for assessing any variation in districts from a standard of equality: (1) Does a plan represent a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population; and (2) Is any "significant" variance between districts necessary to achieve some legitimate state goal? *Id.* at 731; *Anne Arundel County Republican Central Committee v. State Advisory Board of Election Laws*, 781 F.Supp. 394, 396 (D.Md. 1991).

The first prong of the *Karcher* test is essentially a comparative exercise: What are the deviations from

equality existing in the proffered plans? *Cf. Karcher,* 462 U.S. at 739-40 (alternate plans with lower population deviation were presented to legislature); *Hastert v. State Board of Elections,* 777 F.Supp. 634, 644 (N.D.Ill. 1991) (two plans compared for deviation). As to the second prong of the test, important state goals justifying "significant" variations include, but are not necessarily limited to, "making districts compact, respecting municipal boundaries, preserving the cores of prior districts, and avoiding contests between incumbent Representatives." *Karcher,* 462 U.S. at 740.

2. General Assembly Plans

The rigorous standard of population equality demanded of congressional districts under U.S. Const. Art. 1, § 2, is not equally applicable to redistricting of state legislative districts. *Karcher,* 462 U.S. at 732-33. Such districts are governed by the one man, one vote principle inherent in the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Reynolds,* 377 U.S. 533 (1964).

After holding both houses of a state legislature must make an honest and good faith effort to apportion on the basis of nearly equal population, *Id.* at 577, the *Reynolds* Court explained its reasoning by adding "we realize that it is a practical impossibility to arrange legislative districts so that each one has an identical number of residents, or citizens or voters. Mathematical exactness or precision is hardly a workable constitutional requirement." *Id.* Thus, in redistricting state assemblies, "both houses of the state legislature must be apportioned so that districts are 'as nearly of equal population as is

practicable.'" *Chapman v. Meier*, 420 U.S. 1, 22 (1975) (quoting *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 577). "[S]ubstantial compliance" with the goal of equality, not absolute arithmetic equality, is required. *Chapman*, 420 U.S. at 22. Unlike redistricting of congressional districts, the Supreme Court has specifically acknowledged that *de minimus* variation in state legislative districts is permissible in court-devised redistricting plans for such assemblies. *Id.* at 2627; *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 414. An explanation of and the development of this standard is set forth below.

Technology is such today that precise population equality is not only possible but commonplace in state redistricting plans. Thus, the focus has shifted from a question of what can practicably be done to a question of what is desirable within a redistricting process. Despite technological modernity, state legislatures remain free to apportion themselves outside the boundaries of mathematical precision, but only if the deviation is "minor" and "based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy." *Chapman*, 420 U.S. at 23-24. (explaining *Mahan v. Howell*, 410 U.S. 315 (1973) and quoting *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 579)). As a general rule, a legislatively enacted apportionment plan with a maximum deviation under 10 percent falls within this category of minor deviations, *Brown v. Thompson*, 462 U.S. 835, 842 (1983), whereas a plan with larger disparities in population creates a *prima facie* case of discrimination and must therefore be justified by the state. *Id.* at 842-43.

The function of this court, however, is much different from that of a state legislature. It is axiomatic by now that redistricting is primarily a matter for legislative consideration and determination. *Wise v. Lipscomb*, 437 U.S. 535,

539 (1978). This is chiefly because a state legislature is better situated to identify and recommend traditional state policies within the constitutionally mandated framework of substantial population equality. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 414-15. In sharp contrast, this court possesses no distinctive mandate to compromise potentially conflicting state redistricting policies in the people's name. *Id.* at 415. Rather, we are admonished to "achieve the goal of population equality with little more than *de minimis* variation." *Chapman*, U.S. at 27. Given that compliance with the principles of one man, one vote is the preeminent concern of court-ordered plans, the very real possibility exists that certain state policies will be compromised in a court-ordered plan which could have been better served had judicial intervention not been necessary.

Although all concede this process is to be guided by the *de minimus* standard, this standard should be clearly elucidated. *Chapman*, the seminal case on court-ordered redistricting plans for state legislatures, holds merely this:

> . . . unless there are persuasive justifications, a court-ordered reapportionment plan of a state legislature must avoid use of multimember districts, and, as well, must ordinarily achieve the goal of population equality with little more than *de minimus* variation. [footnote omitted]. Where important and significant state considerations rationally mandate departure from these standards, it is the reapportioning court's responsibility to articulate precisely why a plan of single-member districts with minimal population variance cannot be adopted.

Id. at 26-27.

There is no definition or demarcation of the *de minimus* standard offered except to say district courts are not required to "attain the mathematical preciseness required for congressional redistricting." *Id.* at 27 n.19. While population equality may well have been the goal of the *Chapman* Court, it was not the requirement. Rather, the opinion clearly states "[w]ith a court-ordered plan, any deviation from approximate population equality must be supported by enunciation of historically significant state policy or unique features." *Id.* at 26. Thus, this quote equates approximate population equality directly with the *de minimus* standard. In sum, the *de minimus* standard is approximate population equality, not exact population equality *coupled with* justification.

Under this theory, there are but three types of court-ordered state redistricting plans: 1) those plans which meet the standard of *de minimis* deviation, 2) those plans which do not meet the *de minimus* standard but whose departure is justified by the court; and 3) those plans which neither meet the standard nor are justified. A non-exhaustive list of state policy factors which might justify greater than *de minimis* variations includes: maintenance of county or other political subdivision boundaries, *Conner v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 419; compactness and contiguity of legislative districts; and recognition of historical and natural boundaries, *Meier*, 420 U.S. at 23. See also *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 740 (listing factors justifying possible deviations from equality).

If a plan meets the *de minimus* standard, there need not be any discussion of state policy unless there are other plans which are constitutionally acceptable. Then, of course, a discussion of a state's policies and unique

features is relevant, and in fact necessary, to determine which of the constitutionally acceptable plans best serves those policies or unique features. Importantly, the standard by which the court chooses from among acceptable plans is not the same standard by which a court would have to justify departure from the *de minimus* standard in the first instance. *Cf. Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 420-421.[30]

If the court must, as some assert,[31] elucidate the reasons behind any departure from exact population equality and articulate clearly the relationship between the deviation and the state policy furthered, then there is no cognizable distinction between the *de minimus* standard and the standard for congressional redistricting. Assuredly, this was not the aim of the *Chapman* Court as

---

[30] If, in selecting among constitutionally acceptable plans, the court orders one plan to the exclusion of "statistically less offensive plans," it must provide rationale for its decision. *Chapman*, 420 U.S. at 26. Conversely, if a court attempts to rehabilitate a plan which does not meet the *de minimus* requirement in the first instance, it must "articulate clearly the relationship between the variance and the state policy furthered." *Id.* 420 U.S. at 24.

[31] Despite footnote 19 in *Chapman*, one school of thought reads *Chapman* to mean the *de minimus* standard is exact population equality coupled in every instance of deviation with justification by reference to state policies or unique features. Julie Edwards, Comment, *The Right to Vote and Reapportionment in the Texas Legislature*, 41 Baylor L. Rev. 689 (1989). This theory issues from that portion of *Chapman* which reads: "[t]he burden is on the District Court to elucidate the reasons necessitating any departure from the goal of population equality, and to articulate clearly the relationship between the variance and the state policy furthered." *Id.* at 24.

footnote 19 clearly evidences. As support for this footnote, the Court cited a litany of cases, including *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526 (1969), in which the Court refused an invitation to apply the *de minimus* standard to congressional redistricting. In discussing the proposed *de minimus* standard in *Kirkpatrick*, the Court offered an illuminating, if not dispositive, description of the *de minimus* standard:

> We reject Missouri's argument that there is a fixed numerical or percentage population variance small enough to be considered *de minimus* and to satisfy without question the 'as nearly as practicable' standard. The whole thrust of the 'nearly as practicable' approach is inconsistent with the adoption of fixed numerical standards which excuse population variances without regard to the circumstances of each particular case . . . There are other reasons for rejecting the *de minimus* approach. We can see no nonarbitrary way to pick a cutoff point at which population variances suddenly become *de minimus*.

Id. at 530-31.

Thus, it is clear the *Chapman* Court knew full well that the advantages, or disadvantages, of the *de minimus* standard included "a fixed numerical or percentage population variance small enough to be considered *de minimus . . . without question.*" *Kirkpatrick*, 394 U.S. at 530. (emphasis added). Not only did the *Chapman* Court not take pains to distinguish the characteristics proposed in *Kirkpatrick*, which dealt with *congressional* plans, it cited to *Kirkpatrick* immediately upon announcing the new rule for court-ordered plans for state legislatures. *Chapman*, 420 U.S. at 27 n.19. Thus, it is patently clear to this court

the *de minimus* standard, with regard to state legislative bodies, "excuse[s] population variances *without regard to the circumstances of each particular case,*" which is precisely what the Chapman opinion intended. *Kirkpatrick*, 394 U.S. at 530. (emphasis added).

In addition to representing a lucid reading of *Chapman* and *Kirkpatrick*, this conclusion protects the established trichotomy between state legislative plans enacted by state legislatures, state legislative plans ordered by courts, and congressional reapportionment plans. We conclude, without quantifying the *de minimus* standard,[32] that the standard lies somewhere between the 10 percent presumption of *Brown* and the mathematical preciseness required for congressional redistricting under *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, (1964), and in the opinion of this court, it lies closer to *Wesberry* than *Brown*.[33]

---

[32] "Neither courts nor legislatures are furnished any specialized calipers that enable them to extract from the general language of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment the mathematical formula that establishes what range of percentage deviations is permissible, and what is not." *Mahan v. Howell*, 410 U.S. 315, 329 (1973).

[33] The *Chapman* Court opined that court-ordered reapportionment of a state legislature need not attain the preciseness required for congressional redistricting, but the Court also "refused to assume that a 5.95% deviation would necessarily satisfy the high standards required of court-ordered plans." *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 418 n. 17.

C

Dilution of Minority Voting Opportunities

The redistricting of the General Assembly and the Congressional delegation of the state reflects a change in voting procedures and practices which would require preclearance under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c, if the General Assembly and Governor had discharged their respective duties in such manner that redistricting plans were enacted. *Georgia v. United States*, 411 U.S. 526, 535 (1973). Because, as set forth below, the court does not adopt any plan proffered to the court by the parties *in toto*, but rather has fashioned its own remedial plans as to the General Assembly and congressional seats, such preclearance is not required for the court's plans to take effect. *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130, 138 (1981) ("[T]he Act's preclearance requirement does not apply to plans prepared and adopted by a federal court to remedy a constitutional violation").

In fashioning relief, however, the court must be cognizant of § 5 concerns that voting changes have neither the "purpose . . . [nor] the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote" on the basis of race. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c. *See McDaniel*, 452 U.S. at 148-49. We take it as a given that this court, in fashioning its remedy, is not acting with a racially discriminatory purpose. *See Seamon v. Upham*, 536 F.Supp. 931, 944 (E.D.Tex), *vacated and remanded on other grounds sub. nom., Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37 (1982) (per curiam).

In assessing a proposed plan for discriminatory effect under § 5, the Supreme Court has set forth a "retrogression" standard. *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130, 141

(1976); *City of Lockhart v. United States*, 460 U.S. 125 (1983). As set forth in the application of retrogression analysis is "straightforward." *Id.*, 425 U.S. at 142. In *Beer*, the Supreme Court compared "the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise" under the plan of apportionment as it existed immediately before the proposed change and the position of racial minorities after implementation of the change. *Id.* at 142. Thus, where under the old plan no district had a majority of minority population or voters; and under the new plan two districts had majority-minority populations, and one of those districts also contained a majority of minority voters, no retrogression occurred and the plan was valid under § 5. *Id.*; *See also City of Lockhart*, 460 U.S. at 135 (where minorities are in at least the same position with respect to electoral opportunities before and after a change, no retrogression occurs). Thus, retrogression refers to diminution in minority opportunity from what it had been under an earlier plan. *See* discussion, *infra*, regarding "majority/opportunity" districts, page 45. The Department of Justice regulations pertaining to retrogression utilize this same benchmark: "In determining whether a submitted change is retrogressive the Attorney General will normally compare the submitted change to the voting practice or procedure in effect at the time of the submission." 28 C.F.R. § 51.54 (1991).

The court notes two permissible bases and one false basis for assessing retrogression. Retrogression may be measured by simply comparing the gross number of districts with minority population and voting majorities in the old plan and the number of such districts drawn in the proposed plan. This was essentially the approach

taken in *Beer. See also Ketchum v. Byrne*, 740 F.2d 1398, 1402 n. 2 (7th Cir. 1984). There are two possible points at which to measure minority voting opportunities under an old plan: (1) at the time the old plan was originally drawn, or (2) at the time the new plan is proposed to replace the old plan. The point is illustrated by reference to the old General Assembly plans in this case. As originally drawn using 1980 census figures, the State Senate contained ten districts with total black population majorities; the State House of Representative contained 26 such districts.[34]

---

[34] The following table sets forth total and voting age (BVAP) population percentages for the majority black districts in the old plans for the General Assembly using 1980 census figures and 1990 census figures:

Senate

	1980 Census		1990 Census		Current Pop.
Dist.	%Blk.	%BVAP	%Blk.	%BVAP	Deviation %
7 *	50.23	45.31	52.35	48.15	-17.80
19*	58.75	54.48	56.47	53.90	+07.28
21	50.83	48.04	54.30	50.86	-17.89
30*	59.30	55.51	58.34	54.61	-17.54
32	58.15	53.90	59.85	55.15	-16.06
36	63.24	59.15	62.51	58.61	-11.81
39*	59.18	55.25	60.39	56.51	-12.47
40	50.69	48.20	54.06	51.90	-12.66
42*	59.13	53.54	63.28	57.02	-24.37
45*	54.60	50.53	55.02	50.88	+00.96

House

23*	68.44	60.53	69.69	65.01	-22.43
31*	64.47	58.62	72.15	65.91	-18.86
41	55.71	57.07	55.92	51.91	-08.84
49*	54.73	52.18	49.92	47.30	+00.75
50	60.04	55.25	60.55	56.30	-13.38
57	48.01	44.98	51.87	47.19	-11.49

(Continued on following page)

When 1990 census figures are applied to the Senate districts, each retains a majority black population, though the total percentage of blacks decreased in three of the ten districts as a result of "natural retrogression." *See, supra,* note 34. In the State House, application of the 1990 figures shows that eight of the districts declined in percentage of black population, and two districts actually

---

(Continued from previous page)

59	51.89	47.57	55.83	51.17	-12.09
62*	62.58	59.28	65.00	61.10	-17.71
64	55.64	51.67	54.34	50.28	-06.35
66*	71.93	68.88	72.71	69.69	-17.52
70*	60.26	57.71	63.07	60.35	-18.15
73*	73.64	68.68	82.01	78.44	-25.68
74*	67.85	62.29	76.83	71.79	-20.08
77*	64.02	59.00	61.87	58.77	-14.92
90	58.10	54.53	62.91	58.95	-18.55
93	53.40	51.23	51.56	48.73	-00.52
94*	65.00	61.06	64.50	59.76	-10.80
95	62.71	60.70	67.17	65.04	-17.58
101*	70.79	66.32	72.96	68.64	-11.82
102*	57.11	53.70	56.96	53.63	-05.46
103	51.92	48.13	52.62	48.10	-08.40
109*	55.90	48.55	67.30	65.16	-37.09
110	53.83	46.50	42.50	36.41	-20.79
111*	60.95	55.43	71.74	67.23	-18.53
116*	61.82	57.65	54.25	50.26	-05.07
120	50.12	46.49	52.09	47.44	-10.10
122*	51.25	48.10	54.26	51.82	-04.38

Those districts designated with a "*" are currently occupied by a black senator or representative.

At trial, the parties operated under the assumption that the State House of Representatives, as originally drawn, contained 27 districts with majority-minority populations. District 57 did not, in fact, contain such a majority. S.C. Code § 2-1-10; Summary Tape File (STF 1A, 1B), 1980 Decennial Census.

became majority white districts. *Id.* This "natural retrogression" reflects either black emigration from existing black majority districts in greater proportion than whites (House Dist. 110 Charleston County), or an influx of proportionally greater numbers of whites into a district (House Dist. 49, Rock Hill, York County). The Department of Justice regulations suggest that use of the most current census data as applied to the old plan serves as an appropriate benchmark from which to measure the effect of the new plan:

> In determining whether a submitted change is retrogressive the Attorney General will normally compare the submitted change to the voting practice or procedure in effect at the time of submission. . . . The Attorney General will make the comparison *based on the conditions existing at the time of the submission.*

28 C.F.R. § 51.54 (1990) (emphasis added); See also Ketchum. 740 F.2d at 1202.

A second possible and permissible means of evaluating retrogression could involve a district by district comparison of black population and voting age population in the old and new plans. This comparison, however, has great potential to mislead. Where a new plan does not substantially reincorporate the geographic territory of black majority districts from the old plan, the comparison diminishes in value. Where, as in South Carolina, black majority districts are generally geographically contiguous and have suffered dramatic declines in population through natural retrogression, see note 34, *supra*, it may be necessary to shift black population from one district to

another, or bring additional white population into a district to satisfy one man, one vote constitutional requirements. Such shifting of population can make district by district comparisons meaningless. Consequently, the court looked first to retrogression in the total number of districts in a given plan and only then to decreases in population within a given district, where meaningful comparisons, if any, could be made.

The erroneous basis for measuring retrogression, urged upon the court by certain parties to this suit, is to compare proffered plans one to another without reference to the existing plan. This proposed methodology is flawed in at least two respects. First, it has no basis in case law, the statutes, or § 5 regulations. See *Beer*, 425 U.S. at 142 (comparison of proposed plan to existing plan); *City of Lockhart*, 460 U.S. at 134-36 (same); *Ketchum*, 740 F.2d at 1402 (same); 28 C.F.R. § 51.54(b) (benchmark is the old plan).[35] Second, such methodology serves as a "racial

---

[35] *Wilkes County, Ga. v. United States*, 450 F.Supp. 1168 (D.D.C. 1978) was cited as supporting the proposition of inter-plan comparison. In *Wilkes County*, the county's board of commissioners was originally composed of a mayor, elected at-large, and four commissioners elected from single-member districts. In 1972, the county attempted to convert to a completely at-large system with a residency requirement as to the four districts. At the time of the proposed change, the single-member districts were severely malapportioned. While the change was ostensibly made to satisfy one man, one vote concerns, the district court found that the change was purposely made to dilute increasing black voting strength. *Id.* at 1176.

(Continued on following page)

ratchet," which presumes that the plan offering the greatest number of black majority districts is, for that reason alone and regardless of all other considerations, the benchmark against which all other plans must be measured. Such an approach enshrines the notion that the Voting Rights Act insures proportional representation by race, a proposition that flies squarely in the face of case law and statute. *See Beer*, 425 U.S. at 141; 42 U.S.C. § 1973b.

III

SECTION 2 of the VOTING RIGHTS ACT

As previously noted, this proceeding arises under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act.[36] While the provisions of § 5 are

---

(Continued from previous page)

In attempting to assess whether or not the new at-large system had the effect of diluting black voting strength, the court made two comparisons. First, the court concluded that if the malapportioned districts had been retained, blacks would have exercised more influence than under the new, at-large plan. *Id.* at 1178. Because the change also represented a change in election systems, not simply a redistricting of the same system, the court also thought it appropriate to compare black opportunity under the new plan with a hypothetical properly apportioned district and concluded that such comparison also indicated retrogression. *Id.* This second holding of *Wilkes County* is pure *obiter dicta* in that the finding of purposeful discrimination and unlawful effect under standard comparisons was sufficient to invalidate the proposed change. The hypothetical plan comparison utilized has no utility in a case, such as the present one, where there is no change in the electoral system.

[36] 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

directed at specific jurisdictions, the provisions of § 2 are national in scope. Nevertheless, sections 2 and 5 of the Act are not necessarily mutually exclusive and the court has been guided by several aspects of § 2 in developing its remedy. A brief history of the evolution of § 2 is discussed herein and the relationship between sections 2 and 5 is discussed more fully below.

A

1982 Amendments

As amended and in pertinent part, § 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 protects the voting rights of members of protected classes and language minorities and reads as follows:

> (a) No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2), as provided in subsection (b).
>
> (b) A violation of subsection (a) is established if, based on the totality of the circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the state or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. The extent

> to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one "circumstance" which may be considered, provided that nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population.

42 U.S.C. § 1973.

As originally passed, the language of § 2 was intended to parallel the language of the Fifteenth Amendment. *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, 446 U.S. 55, 60-61 (1980) (plurality opinion). Based on this parallel, a plurality of the Supreme Court held that a plaintiff was required to prove discriminatory intent to establish a violation of § 2. *Id.* at 62, 71. In response to the Supreme Court's ruling in *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, Congress amended § 2 in 1982 to include a "results," or "effects," test to determine if racial vote dilution has occurred. *See* Senate Report at 27; *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 35 (1986).

B

Thornburg v. Gingles

In 1986, the Supreme Court had the opportunity to review the amendments to § 2 in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986). *Gingles* involved a § 2 challenge to the use of multi-member districts in North Carolina. The Court held that "[t]he essence of a § 2 claim is that a certain electoral law, practice, or structure interacts with social and historical conditions to cause an inequality in the opportunities enjoyed by black and white voters to elect their preferred representatives." *Id.* at 47.

In determining if a § 2 violation has occurred, "a court must assess the impact of the contested structure or practice on minority electoral opportunities 'on the basis of objective factors.' " *Id.* at 44 (quoting Senate Report at 27). The Court then reiterated the list of "typical" factors which may be relevant to, and probative of, a § 2 claim as set forth in the Senate Report. Now known as the "Senate factors," these factors are:

> 1. the extent of any history of official discrimination in the state or political subdivision that touches the right of the members of the minority group to register, to vote, or otherwise to participate in the democratic process;
>
> 2. the extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized;
>
> 3. the extent to which the state or political subdivision has used unusually large election districts, majority vote requirements, anti-single shot provisions, or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group;
>
> 4. if there is a candidate slating process, whether the members of the minority group have been denied access to that process;
>
> 5. the extent to which members of the minority group in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process;
>
> 6. whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals;

> 7. the extent to which members of the minority group have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction.
>
> Additional factors that in some cases have added probative value as part of plaintiffs' evidence to establish a violation are:
>
> whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group.
>
> whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivision's use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice or procedure is tenuous.

Id. at 37, 45.

The Court noted, as did the Senate Report, that this list is not exhaustive, nor is it required that any number of factors be proved, and other factors may be relevant. *Id.* at 45. The Court did note, however, that "the most important Senate Report factors bearing on § 2 challenges to multi-member districts are the 'extent to which minority group members have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction' and the 'extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized.' " *Id.* at 49 n.15.

The Court, however, set forth important limitations on the extent to which these factors establish liability under § 2 by stating:

> [w]hile many or all of the factors listed in the Senate Report may be relevant to a claim of vote dilution through submergence in multimember districts, unless there is a conjunction of the

following circumstances, the use of multimember districts generally will not impede the ability of minority voters to elect representatives of their choice.

The Court then listed three circumstances which "are necessary preconditions for multi-member districts to operate to impair minority voters' ability to elect representatives of their choice." *Id.* at 49-50. These preconditions[37] are:

---

[37] Although there is some debate over the extent to which the three prongs of *Gingles* must be viewed as threshold requirements for a § 2 remedy, *Solomon v. Liberty County, Florida*, 899 F.2d 1012, 1022 (11th Cir. 1990) (en banc) (Tjoflat, J. concurring); Karlan, *Maps and Misreadings: The Role of Geographic Compactness in Racial Vote Dilution Litigation*, 24 Harv. C.R.-C.L. Rev. 173 (Winter 1989) (hereinafter *Maps and Misreadings*), the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has clearly held that these three prongs are threshold requirements. *McGhee v. Granville, Co., North Carolina*, 860 F.2d 110, 117 (4th Cir. 1988). The *McGhee* court based its finding, in part, on the "open-ended nature" of a court's inquiry under the totality of the circumstances test, *Id.* at 116, and its concern that left "unbounded," the totality of the circumstances test could be applied to find dilution in any case where the black minority is not represented in proportion to their percentage of the voting age population, which is clearly contrary to the 1982 amendments to § 2. *Id.*

In addition, the *McGhee* court cited favorably to *McNeil v. Springfield Park District*, 851 F.2d 937 (7th Cir. 1988) which stated that "[t]he creation of preconditions – a choice of clear rules over muddy efforts to discern equity – shields the courts from meritless claims and ensures that clearly meritorious

(Continued on following page)

> 1) the minority group must be able to demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single member district;
>
> 2) the minority group must be able to show that it is politically cohesive; and
>
> 3) the minority group must be able to demonstrate that the white majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it – in the absence of special circumstances, such as the minority candidate running unopposed – usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate.

Id. at 50.

Thus, the *Gingles* decision provided a framework with which to analyze § 2 challenges. The practical application of these factors, however, has been the subject of considerable discussions[38] and it is not entirely clear to what extent *Gingles* applies to the single-member districts involved in this case. Lacking any further guidance, we have applied the decision in Gingles as set forth below.

(Continued from previous page)

claims will survive summary judgment." The court in *McNeil* also noted that the Voting Rights Act, despite being a "crucially important piece of national legislation," remains "subject to the same considerations of administration as other similar statutes." *Id.* at 943.

[38] *See* Quinn, Sallet, and Simon, *Congressional Redistricting in the 1990s: The Impact of the 1982 Amendments to the Voting Rights Act*, 1 Geo. Mason U. Civ. Rights. L.J. 207 (Winter 1990) (hereinafter "Congressional Redistricting"); See Karlan, *Maps and Misreadings:*, 24 Harv. C.R.-C.L. Rev. 173.

Floating through the framework of Gingles and its progeny are several concepts, the definitions of which are important to the court's decision. Briefly, these definitions are 1) How does the court define a "majority?"; 2) What is the definition of "compactness?"; 3) What is the definition of "community of interest?"; and 4) What is the definition of "political cohesion?" Before defining these concepts, however, the court must first address the extent to which it has considered § 2 in its analysis.

C

Application of § 2 to this Proceeding

The application of § 2 to this case has its genesis in the admonition of the Supreme Court in *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 425 (1977) that "it is imperative for the District Court, in drawing up a new plan, to make every effort not only to comply with the established constitutional standards, but also to allay suspicions and avoid the creation of concerns that might lead to new constitutional challenges." It would be incongruous for the court to adopt a plan which did not comport with the standards and guidelines of § 2. The issue, however, is not whether § 2 considerations are considered – they most certainly are; but rather, whether the court is obligated to completely graft the tests and requirements of § 2, including the searching evidentiary requirements, into a § 5 proceeding.

First, we will establish why a complete adoption of § 2 standards is unwarranted in this proceeding under § 5. Then, we will set forth the standard by which we have reviewed the various plans with respect to § 2

considerations. Finally, we will return to the definition of the four concepts mentioned above.

1. The Substantive Standards for § 2 Should not be Completely Imported into this § 5 Proceeding

Based on three factors, in conjunction with the particularized facts of this case, the court holds that it is not obligated to completely import the standards and requirements of § 2 into a proceeding under § 5. These factors are: 1) the fundamental differences between § 2 and § 5; 2) the particular time factor associated with this case, and 3) the lack of a clear legislative intent or judicial interpretation that the results test of § 2 should be completely imported into § 5.

a. Important differences between § 2 and § 5

Although sections 2 and 5 are similar in their goal of providing minorities with an equal opportunity to elect the representatives of their choice, several important differences exist between the sections. First, each section was designed to address different manifestations of the same problem – disenfranchisement of minorities. As noted earlier, the parameters of § 5 were developed in response to the exclusion of primarily Southern blacks from the voting booth through the use of poll taxes, literacy tests, and other overt forms of racial discrimination and the persistence of the covered districts in developing new methods of vote dilution as the former methods were judicially invalidated. *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 384-85 (1966). As a state with a

history of such discrimination, South Carolina is a covered district under § 5.[39] 42 U.S.C § 1973c.

Consequently, the original focus of § 5 was to provide minorities in those districts with a history of overt racial discrimination with special protections; which included the preclearance requirement for any *change* in voting procedure. *See Id.* An action under § 5 therefore, must be precleared by the Justice Department or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c. Under § 5, the effect of the new plan is determined by its retrogressive effect on the ability of minorities to elect representatives of their choice. *City of Lockhart v. United States*, 460 U.S. 125 (1983); *Beer v. United States*, 425 U.S. 130 (1976); *See supra* pages 24 to 31.

Section 2, on the other hand, was national in scope and provided a private right of action to remedy the denial or abridgement of the right to vote. *See Solomon v. Liberty County, Florida*, 899 F.2d 1012, 1023-32 (11th Cir. 1990) (en banc) (Tjoflat, J. concurring). As a result, the provisions of § 2 had to address the more subtle forms of

---

[39] In *Graham v. State of South Carolina*, No. 84-1430, at 24 (D.S.C. filed July 31, 1984), this court held that "the political processes leading to the nomination and election to public office are equally open to minority races and minority parties." The Lieutenant Governor interprets this remark to mean that the court need only inquire post-1984 for evidence of discrimination. While this may be true in the context of overt forms of discrimination, such as exclusion of blacks from the Democratic Primary as was discussed in *Graham*, in light of the factors enumerated in *Gingles*, we decline to give the language in *Graham* such broad meaning with regard to the *effects* of prior discrimination.

race discrimination. *See McGhee v. Granville County, North Carolina*, 860 F.2d 110, 116 (4th Cir. 1988). Thus, as the law has evolved under § 2, a broader, "results," test has developed. Senate Report at 23-31. It is important to remember, however, that § 2 involves a challenge to the effects or intent of a *specific* plan and the crucial aspect of the proceeding is the determination of liability. *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 44 (quoting Senate Report at 27).

In turn, the different tests and the different means by which an action under either section proceeds give rise to additional considerations. First, there are the differences in the burden of proof. In a § 5 proceeding, the jurisdiction proposing the change in the voting structure bears the burden of proof whereas in a § 2 proceeding the plaintiff bears the burden of proof. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c *et seq.* Since a § 2 plaintiff is *attacking* an existing practice and a plan being challenged under § 5 must be *advocated*, the difference in the nature of the proceedings makes the necessity for this allocation obvious. Yet, in the context of this case, in which no less than five plans have been submitted for each political body, the burden of proof becomes more complex, especially if the whole of the results test is injected into the proceeding. The court, which is operating more in the nature of a forum, is thus reluctant to tamper with the burden of proof in the absence of sufficient legislative or judicial guidance.[40]

---

[40] *See County Council v. United States*, 555 F. Supp. 694, 698 (D.D.C. 1983) ("Whether . . . the "results" standard of Section 2 can properly be imported in Section 5 presents a complex issue which can be decided only after a comprehensive assessment

(Continued on following page)

The differences between § 2 and § 5 also give rise to several concerns regarding the advisory nature of an opinion of a three-judge panel that the adopted plans completely conform to § 2 criteria. First, there is the obvious difficulty that in the broad spectrum of the "results" test of § 2, any testimony regarding the effect of the proposed plans is sheer speculation. In a § 5 proceeding, this difficulty is minimized by the focus on retrogression – a relatively finite concept. *See supra* pages 24 to 31.

Second, under existing law, if a plan has been precleared by the Justice Department, an individual is still entitled to bring a § 2 challenge against the plan.[41] Similarly, when a district court approves or adopts a legislatively approved plan in a § 2 proceeding that is not of its own making, the plan is still subject to § 5 review. *McDaniel v. Sanchez*, 452 U.S. 130, 150 (1981). Our concern, however, is that by completely grafting the requirements of § 2 into § 5, the court would impair the duality of remedies currently afforded aggrieved parties under principles of *res judicata* or separation of powers. We do not resolve this issue today; however, this issue is indicative of the potentially broad reaching effects of importing § 2 into § 5.

(Continued from previous page)

of the statutory scheme and the legislative history") *cited in* Mark E. Haddad, Note, *Getting Results under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act*, 94 Yale L. Rev. 139, 149 n. 75 (1984) (hereinafter *"Getting Results"*).

[41] As discussed *infra*, the Justice Department has incorporated the results test into its analysis under § 5. Nevertheless, the court is unaware of any case which has challenged the validity of this action.

b. Time considerations

Time is also a crucial factor for the court. The fact finding requirements under § 2 are strenuous and appellate courts have required great specificity with regard to the facts determined by local district courts in a § 2 proceeding. *Westwego Citizens for Better Government v. City of Westwego*, 872 F.2d 1201, 1203 (5th Cir. 1989); *Watkins v. Mabus*, 771 F. Supp. 789, 799 (S.D. Miss. 1991) *aff'd in part, vacated in part* 112 S.Ct 412 (1991) (vacated on other grounds). Yet, courts have also recognized that with elections pending on the horizon, the exigency of the circumstances in voting rights cases mandate special consideration. *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 44 (1982); *Mabus*, 771 F. Supp. at 799.

As stated above, no less than five plans were submitted for each political body; and in the case of the Congressional districts, a total of nine plans were offered. The scant case law[42] which advocates a complete incorporation of § 2 into § 5 involves cases where at most two or three plans were under consideration for a single legislative body.[43] Aside from the burden of proof difficulties

---

[42] *Edge v. Sumter County School District*, 775 F.2d 1509, 1510 (11th Cir. 1985); *Hastert v. State Bd. of Elections*, 777 F. Supp. 634 (N.D. Ill. 1991).

[43] The court notes that in our study of the cases under section 5 and section 2, we can find no case in which both bodies of the state legislature as well as the congressional districts for an entire state were redistricted in a single action.

The academic literature advocating the incorporation of the § 2 substantive standard in § 5 does not consider the situation presented in this case. *Getting Results* at 149 n. 75.

discussed above, the evidentiary burden presented by a § 2 challenge to each proposed plan in this case would have been staggering and would likely still be ongoing. The filing dates and primaries have already been postponed once; therefore, in an effort to avoid further delay and mindful of the time considerations which fully incorporating 2 into our proceeding would have produced, the court decided against conducting a full § 2 inquiry.

c. Insufficient legislative history

Given the foregoing discussion of the differences between § 2 and § 5, as well as the particular considerations presented by this case, the lack of legislative or judicial guidance persuades the court that this is not the case in which to create a blanket rule that § 2 guidelines should be infused into § 5. As noted above, the case law supporting such an interpretation of the Voting Rights Act is scant and is not analogous to this case. *See supra* notes 42-43. Admittedly, the Justice Department has incorporated the substantive standard of § 2 into their § 5 review procedures 28 C.F.R. § 51.55(b)(2). Nevertheless, not only is the Justice Department conducting a review of a specifically proposed plan, but the Justice Department is entitled to more latitude with respect to speculation over the effect of a proposed plan than a federal court.

Finally, in light of all of the foregoing, we are not persuaded that in amending the provisions of § 2 in 1982 that Congress had the intent of amending the standard to be applied in § 5 actions. The proponents of such an incorporation cite to footnote 31 of the Senate Report at 12 which states that "[i]n light of the amendment to § 2, it

is intended that a § 5 objection also follow if a new voting procedure itself so discriminates as to violate section 2." While this may be true, it does not necessarily speak to the standard the court is to apply to the § 5 objection. More to the point, in the vast consideration of both § 2 and § 5 during the amendments to § 2 in 1982, had Congress intended to change the well-known standard applied to § 5 in *Beer.* it would not relegate such an important decision to a single footnote.[44]

2. The Standard of Analysis

In shaping our application of § 2 to § 5, we are guided by the admonition in *Gingles* that a determination of "whether the political processes are 'equally open' depends upon a searching practical evaluation of the 'past and present reality.' " *Gingles,* 478 U.S. at 45 (citations omitted). In addition, since it would be anomalous for this court to adopt a plan which immediately lends itself to an attack under § 2, our analysis should ensure that the threshold requirements of a § 2 action cannot be established under the adopted plan. In this regard, we are guided by the decision in *Jeffers v. Clinton,* 730 F. Supp. 196, 205 (E.D.Ark. 1989), *aff'd,* 111 S.Ct. 662 (1991):

---

[44] Brief for the *Amicus Curiae,* Katherine I. Butler, December 9, 1991 at 6. *But see Getting Results,* supra note 40. Although the author of this note makes a plausible argument for interpreting the legislative history of the Voting Rights Act to incorporate the substantive standard of section 2 into section 5, as mentioned previously, the argument overlooks the unique circumstances presented by this case.

> We agree that *Thornburg* and *Smith* cannot be automatically applied to the single-member context. Dilution may be much more obvious in a case like *Smith*, where a potential majority of black voters was submerged in a two-member district. But the basic principle is the same. If lines are drawn that limit the number of majority-black single-member districts, and reasonably compact and contiguous majority-black districts could have been drawn, and if racial cohesiveness in voting is so great that, as a practical matter, black voters' preferences for black candidates are frustrated by this system of apportionment, the outlines of a section 2 theory are made out.

Therefore, with the goal of providing minorities with an equal opportunity to elect the representatives of their choice in mind, we have analyzed the proposed plans as well as the plans we adopt today based on the following factors: 1) the extent to which the plans proposed and the plans adopted are consistent with the retrogression standard set forth in *Beer* and *City of Lockhart*; 2) the extent to which reasonable compact and contiguous majority black districts were and could be drawn; 3) the extent to which the minority group is politically cohesive; 4) the extent to which racially polarized voting patterns exist; 5) the extent to which the lines which have been drawn limit the number of majority-black single-member districts in light of the expressed state policies of the State of South Carolina. The Senate factors may be applied to the extent that they aid the court in its determination of these factors. This approach allows the court to formulate a plan which is consistent not only with the provisions of § 5, but

insures that the court's plan will not violate the threshold requirements for liability under § 2.

3. Defining the Parameters

Having set forth the extent to which the court has applied § 2 requirements to this case, we return to the four terms which we set forth at the outset as important concepts in our analysis.

a. The definition of majority

Webster's has two alternative definitions for majority. One definition is "the excess of such a greater number over the remainder of the total," while the other definition is "the group or party whose votes preponderates." Webster's Third New International Dictionary 1363. The two definitions highlight the different interpretations of majority in the context of the Voting Rights Act. While one definition speaks purely in terms of number, the other definition speaks in terms of votes and, by inference, political power. As a result, courts have attempted to reconcile the pure numerical sense of majority with the concept of an equal opportunity to elect the representative of one's choice. Typically, the reconciliation of these two definitions has occurred in the decision of the court to use either voting age population or total population as the measure of opportunity within a given district. *See McDaniel v. Mehfoud*, 708 F. Supp. 754, 756 (E.D.Va. 1989). The distinction is obviously important because defining majority sets the benchmark by which effective political opportunity is measured.

In this case, the court has looked to the voting age population as the measure of the opportunity to elect the candidate of one's choice. In this regard, we are guided by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in *McGhee*, 860 F.2d 110, in which the court held that a 51.8 percent black voting age population was sufficient to establish a remedy for a § 2 violation. *Mehfoud*, 708 F. Supp. at 756. The *McGhee* court relied heavily throughout its opinion on the Seventh Circuit's opinion in *McNeil v. Springfield Park District*, 851 F.2d 937, 944-45 (7th Cir. 1988) (emphasis in original) in which Judge Cudahy wrote that "[i]n explaining its requirement, the *Gingles* Court consistently refers to 'minority voters,' for only *voters* can demonstrate the potential to elect candidates of their choice." Although the Ninth Circuit has held that total population may be an adequate measure, *Garza v. County of Los Angeles*, 918 F.2d 763, 774-76 (9th Cir. 1990), the implication in *McGhee* that voting age population is the correct measure, as well as the holding in *Mehfoud*, leads us to conclude that political opportunity is best measured in terms of minority voting age population. Thus, a district may be considered a black opportunity district if the percentage of the black voting age population is greater than 50 percent.

Another issue which falls within the concept of majority is the alleged "65 percent rule." The origins of the "65 percent rule" are somewhat unclear;[45]

---

[45] The concept was first recognized in *United Jewish Organization v. [sic] of Williamsburgh, Inc. v. Carey*, 430 U.S. 144, 164 (1977); yet, there is no indication that the Court intended to

(Continued on following page)

nevertheless, the principle for which the rule stands is that to create an effective majority-minority district, the court should ideally create a district with a 65 percent majority-minority population as a remedy for a § 2 violation. The 65 percent is achieved by adjusting the bare 50 percent majority of total population by 5 percent for young population, 5 percent for low voter registration and 5 percent for low voter turn-out among minorities. *Ketchum v. Byrnes*, 740 F.2d 1398, 1415 (7th Cir. 1984).

The "65 percent rule" has been increasingly rejected as a bright line remedy. *See e.g., Neal v. Coleburn*, 689 F. Supp. 1426, 1438 (E.D. Va. 1988).[46] As the court noted in *Coleburn*, "the 65% standard is a flexible and practical guideline to consider in fashioning relief for a § 2 violation." *Id.* First, as opposed to *Coleburn* in which total population figures were used as a baseline, *Id.* at 1437, our use of voting age population as the measure for effective opportunity obviates the need to consider a 65 percent figure as an absolute measure of effective political opportunity. *Ketchum*, 740 F.2d at 1413.

Second, beyond the use of voting age population, we have considered other factors, such as the presence of an incumbent in a district, in formulating our plans. With regard to the presence of an incumbent in a district, the

---

(Continued from previous page)

give this guideline talismanic significance. Indeed, the Senate Report on the 1982 Amendments to the Voting Rights Act notes that the number 65 originated from a phone call to an unknown staffer at the Justice Department. Senate Report at 121 n. 40.

[46] *See also Congressional Redistricting* at 236-43.

undisputed testimony was that the lack of, or presence of, an incumbent in a district has an effect on voter turnout and this effect is more pronounced for black voters as opposed to white voters. For example, in a district in which there is a black incumbent running, the black voter turnout will be greater than if there is no incumbent running, which will, in turn be greater than if a white incumbent were running. Transcript of Dr. Loewen p. 44-47. This measure then obviously has some impact on the effectiveness of the black voting age population and we have taken this into account in our analysis of the plans.

The final issue with respect to defining majority is the importance of "influence districts." Simply put, influence districts are those districts in which the minority population is sizeable but insufficient to comprise a majority of the voting age population. *See Congressional Redistricting* at 223. In *Gingles,* the Court specifically declined to rule on whether courts were obligated to consider "a claim brought by a minority group, that is not sufficiently large and compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district, alleging that the use of multi-member districts impairs its ability *to influence* elections." 478 U.S. at 46 n.12 (emphasis in the original). This case does not present the opportunity to decide this issue. Therefore, we have not considered the extent to which influence districts have been or could have been created.[47]

---

[47] The peculiarly political dilemma faced by courts regarding influence districts was illustrated at trial by the opposing

(Continued on following page)

b. The definitions of compactness and community of interest

Since the *Gingles* opinion was written, there has been considerable discussion on the definition of compactness

---

(Continued from previous page)

views of Nelson Rivers, President of the South Carolina Chapter of the NAACP, and Robert Sheheen, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Rivers eschewed the concept of an influence district in favor of maximizing the number of majority-minority, or "opportunity" districts which could be created. Mr. Rivers defined "opportunity district" as "having an equal opportunity to elect a candidate of choice of the black community," Rivers' Transcript at 26, which during his visits with the local chapters of the NAACP came down to the same question "am I in a district that has an opportunity to elect a black person or am I not?" *Id.* at 49. Regarding influence districts and how the SRAC plan was developed, Mr. Rivers stated:

> We didn't have much respect for influence districts. We thought that was a misnomer, really, a kind of phantom that does not yield real political influence or build political power in the state . . . . [A] good many people had become disabused of the notion that influence really meant much . . . It's much more important to have power, obviously, than influence, and so we tried to make sure that we did everything we could to enhance the opportunity to have power.

Rivers' Transcript at 26, 28 (February 20, 1992).

Alternatively, the potential danger of this approach was explained by Speaker Sheheen. In essence, Speaker Sheheen's point was that the creation of majority-minority districts will decrease the number of black voters in the surrounding districts. As a result, though black voters may be guaranteed that their interests will be represented in that one district, their

(Continued on following page)

and its role as a threshold requirement for liability under § 2. Karlan, *Maps and Misreadings*. In the context of this case, our decision has been guided by the holding of the court in *Dillard v. Baldwin County Bd. of Education*, 686 F. Supp. 1459 (M.D. Ala. 1988) in which the court held that:

> By compactness, *Thornburg* does not mean that a district must meet, or attempt to achieve, some aesthetic absolute, such as symmetry or attractiveness. An aesthetic norm, by itself, would be not only unrelated to the legal and social issues

---

(Continued from previous page)

ability to influence the political acts of the legislators in the remaining districts is lessened. Political segregation occurs because the interests of black constituents are packed into several "guaranteed" seats which, though putatively occupied by minority members, do not form a majority of the legislative whole. As Judge Hill noted in *Solomon*, 899 F.2d at 1038:

> In a democracy, elected office holders tend to advance the interests of their electorate. They have no *political* motivation or pressure to represent other members of the population within their state, district, county or etc. The office holder's official fate is in the hands of those who vote and they can – and historically do – demand responsiveness.

Solomon, 899 F.2d at 1038; *See also Jeffers v. Clinton*, 756 F. Supp. 1195, 1207 (E.D.Ark. 1990) (Eisele, J., dissenting) (emphasis in original); *but see* Karlan, *Maps and Misreadings* at 213.

Thus, without the necessity of building coalitions within the legislative body and among the electorate of a given district, the concern arises that the creation of majority-minority districts as a means of political power serves only to galvanize the separatist barriers that the Voting Rights was designed to attack. Though we certainly do not decide this inherently political issue, we note with apprehension that the Voting Rights Act may be interpreted to promote political apartheid.

> presented under § 2, it would be an unworkable concept, resulting in arbitrary and capricious results, because it offers no guidance as to when it is met . . . The degree of geographical symmetry or attractiveness is therefore a desirable consideration for districting, but only to the extent it aids or facilitates the political process, and only as one among many considerations a court should include, the principal one being § 2's vote dilution prohibition, in determining whether there is sufficient compactness for a majority black district.
>
> The court therefore believes, especially in light of § 2's strong national mandate, that a district is sufficiently geographically compact if it allows for effective representation. For example, a district would not be sufficiently compact if it was so spread out that there was no sense of community, that is, if its members and its representative could not effectively and efficiently stay in touch with each other; or if it was so convoluted that there was no sense of community, that is, if its members and its representative could not easily tell who actually lived within the district. Also of importance, of course, is the compactness of the neighboring districts; obviously, if because of the configuration of a district, its neighboring districts so lacked compactness that they could not be effectively represented, the *Thornburg* standard of compactness would not be met.

Id. at 1465-66.

This functional view of compactness in light of effective representation is a sound approach to the problems of compactness, especially with the ability of modern

technology to create maps which, though they have maximized percentages by pinpointing specific voters, may resemble a series of ink blot tests. Further, this approach allows the court to consider the different communities of interest which may be involved. For example, considerations for a legislative body such as the South Carolina House of Representatives, which has 124 seats, will be different from the considerations for the Congressional districts which are only six in number. The critical aspect of the approach of the court in *Dillard* is that its flexibility is bounded by the degree to which the elected representative can effectively represent the district. The district created must be "manageable" from the standpoint of constituent services. *See id.*

Similarly, our definition of community of interest is also guided by the language in Dillard. At various points of the trial, it was suggested, if not directly stated, that the color of one's skin alone creates a sufficient community of interest. While we do not intend to minimize the important historic and cultural differences which exist between blacks and whites, the color of one's skin, in and of itself, does not create a community of interest.[48]

---

[48] *See Edmonson v. Leesville Concrete Co., Inc.*, 111 S.Ct. 2077, 2088 (1991). In recognizing that preemptory strikes based on race violate the equal protection clause, the Court in *Edmonson* remarked that "[i]f our society is to continue to progress as a multiracial democracy, it must recognize that the automatic invocation of race stereotypes retards the progress and causes continued hurt and injury. By the dispassionate analysis which is its special distinction, the law dispels fears and preconceptions respecting racial attitudes." Although the context is different, we find the analogy applicable to the assumption that the color of one's skin alone creates a community of interest.

Rather, a community's views on crime, employment, education, police brutality, urban sprawl, or urban blight may be just as indicative of a community of interest as whether the members of the community are predominantly black or white or the geometric boundaries of the geographical area. Thus, a community of interest may reflect all of these factors and will vary depending on the legislative body under consideration.

c. Political cohesion and racial bloc voting

As the Court recognized in *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 52 n.18, political cohesion and racial bloc voting are essentially interchangeable concepts. It stated, "[t]he purpose of inquiring into the existence of racially polarized voting is twofold; to ascertain whether minority group members constitute a politically cohesive unit and to determine whether whites vote sufficiently as a bloc usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate." *Id.* at 56. The Court held that " 'racial polarization' exists where there is a consistent relationship between [the] race of the voter and the way in which the voter votes." *Id.* at 53 n. 21.

The Court elaborated on this relationship by stating that "[t]he degree of racial bloc voting that is cognizable as an element of a § 2 dilution claim will vary according to a variety of factual circumstances." *Id.* at 58. Included in this list of factors are the presence of incumbents, lack of opposition, the nature of the allegedly dilutive electoral mechanism, the percentage of registered voters in the district who are members of the minority group as well as the size of the district. *Id.* at 57-58. Finally, the

Gingles Court held that the cause of the correlation in the voting patterns is immaterial. *Id.* at 62.

As a measure of racial polarization, the Court accepted the use of extreme case analysis and bivariate ecological regression to determine if blacks and whites differed in their voting patterns. *Id.* at 53. In this case, both Dr. Arrington and Dr. Loewen used the statistical methods set forth in *Gingles*. Dr. Loewen analyzed election results prior to 1984 and Dr. Arrington analyzed elections primarily from 1984 to the present. Despite the testimony of these witnesses that racially polarized voting exists, the extent to which voting is polarized in South Carolina remains an open question and will certainly vary from locality to locality. *See NAACP v. South Carolina Democratic Party et al.*, No. 88-2492 (D.S.C. filed February 22, 1989), *aff'd*, No. 89-1717, (4th Cir. filed March 1, 1990).[49] For example, the testimony regarding the strength of polarization exhibited in some races, such as the 1990 governor's race, was minimized by factors such as incumbency. Nevertheless, since we are not determining liability under § 2 in this case, the parties' stipulation that since 1984 there is evidence of racially polarized voting in South Carolina is sufficient for our analysis of the plans.

In conclusion, by establishing the framework set forth above, we have attempted to avoid the pitfall noted

---

[49] Plaintiffs' and the Governor's experts repeatedly asserted, with respect to certain areas of the state, that voter polarization had increased since 1982, when § 2 was amended. We note with concern that if this is the case, § 2 appears to not be working in the manner intended.

by Judge Tjoflat in *Solomon* that "amended section 2 'means all things to all parties [and therefore] means nothing at all.' " *Solomon*, 899 F.2d at 1035 (citations omitted). The limitations set forth above represent a practical application of § 2 by providing meaning to the concept of "equal opportunity to elect the representatives of one's choice" in this § 5 proceeding. Having completed this analysis, we consider the individual plans.

IV

THE PLANS

As stated earlier, the court has adopted its own plan for each legislative body. The plans are discussed in the order that evidence was taken at trial. Therefore, the Senate is discussed first, followed by the House of Representatives plan and the Congressional plan. The relevant maps and geography reports are attached hereto as exhibits and are incorporated herein by reference. The Senate exhibits are Appendix A; the House exhibits are Appendix B; and the Congressional exhibits are Appendix C. The population summaries are the first exhibits associated with each set of plans, followed by geography reports, statewide maps, and local maps by county or municipality.

A

Senate Plan[50]

1. Background

In 1895 the people of South Carolina decided their Senate should be composed of "one member from each County,[51] to be elected for the term of four years by the qualified electors in each County, in the same manner in which members of the House of Representatives are elected." S.C. Const. Art. III, § 6. This section was cogently drafted to accomplish two distinct objectives: 1) to set the numerical composition of the Senate as equivalent to the number of counties[52] and 2) to apportion the members on the basis of one senator from each county. *State v. West*, 249 S.C. 243, 246, 153 S.E.2d 892, 893 (1967). The second of these objectives has been nullified for

---

[50] The present Senate plan has a deviation of 63.15 percent, which all parties agree is unacceptable.

[51] In contrast to the explicit provision for 124 members of the House Representatives, no number appears in the Constitution with regard to the Senate, chiefly because the 1895 Constitution contemplated changes in the number of counties. S.C. Const. Art. III, § 3; S.C. Const. Art. III, § 6; S.C. Const. Art. VII, § 1; S.C. Const. Art. VII, § 2.

[52] S.C. Const. Article VIII, § 3, provides "[n]o more than forty-six counties shall exist at any time, but the General Assembly may provide for a lesser number." At the time the provision was drawn, South Carolina consisted of 36 counties. S.C. Const. Art. III, § 3.

conflict with federal law. See *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964).[53]

The numerical composition section of Article III, § 6, survived *Reynolds* but nearly did not survive the Senate itself. The composition was at issue in *O'Shields v. McNair*, 254 F.Supp. 708 (D.S.C. 1966),[54] which involved an attempt by the General Assembly, and more particularly the Senate, to reapportion, using either a Senate/House compromise plan which provided for 50 senators or the Senate's original plan which provided for 59 senators;[55] this despite there being 46 counties in the State in 1966. The three-judge court in *O'Shields* concluded the question of numerical composition was more properly resolved by the state courts, but only after opining in *obiter dicta*:

---

[53] The Equal Protection Clause has been interpreted to require that the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a basis of population. *Reynolds*, 377 U.S at 568.

[54] The *O'Shields* court declared, after a hearing on December 3, 1965, that the present apportionment of the South Carolina Senate, although in strict compliance with the state constitution, could not be squared with federal constitutional requirements in the post *Reynolds* era. Rather than fashion its own plan, the court gave the General Assembly an opportunity to reapportion itself.

[55] The Senate passed a plan which provided itself with 59 seats and the House passed a plan which provided the Senate with 46 seats. A conference committee compromised on a plan which called for 50 seats with the Senate's original 59 seat plan tacked on as the first alternative. The compromise plan was passed February 3, 1966, and suit was filed February 14, 1966.

> [a]fter we held on December 3, 1965 that § 6 of Article III, in its application, was invalid under federal constitutional standards because of the great discrepancies in the populations of the counties, the question arises as to what is left of the provisions of § 6 of Article III. Because the federal constitution requires a reapportionment of South Carolina's Senate, is the General Assembly now free to disregard the heretofore unquestionable, if implicit, provision of the state constitution fixing the size of the Assembly? May the General Assembly now, on its own authority, enlarge the Senate from 46 to 50? To 59? To 75?

Id. at 711.

The South Carolina Supreme Court emphatically answered the questions posed above by holding "Article III, § 6, remains as an effective and valid part of the Constitution of this State for the purpose of determining the size of the Senate." *State v. West*, 249 S.C. at 247, 153 S.E.2d at 894. Thus, the constitutionally infirm section, which apportioned the Senate, was effectively severed from the section which prescribed the numerical composition. Since there are presently forty-six counties in South Carolina, S.C. Code Ann. §§ 4-3-10 through 4-3-530 (1976), there will be forty-six senatorial districts in the court's plan.

2. The Court's Plan

Given a total state population of 3,486,703, the "ideal"[56] senatorial district would have a population of

---

[56] *See* Wollock, ed., *Reapportionment Law and Technology* 6 (1980).

75,798. The largest district in the court's plan,[57] District 21, has a population of 76,516 for a positive deviation of .95 percent (718 persons), and the smallest, District 16, has a population of 75,040 for a negative deviation of -1.00 percent (758 persons). We conclude a total deviation range of 1.95 percent (1476 persons), for the South Carolina Senate, is *de minimis* under the prevailing case law. *Chapman*, 420 U.S. 1 (1975); *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407 (1977); *Cf. White v. Regester*, 412 U.S. 755 (1973) (9.9 percent total deviation in Texas state House districts); *Gaffney v. Cummings*, 412 U.S. 735 (1973) (7.83 percent total deviation in Connecticut state House districts); *Mahan v. Howell*, 410 U.S. 315 (1973) (16.4 percent total deviation in Virginia state House districts).

In addition, we conclude the plans proposed by the Governor (0.0106 percent) and the Republican Party (0.0145 percent) have *de minimis* deviations as well. We must, therefore, provide rationale, using either the federal factor of retrogression or significant and traditional state policies, to explain our rejection of these plans and preference for our own.[58] *Chapman*, 420 U.S. at 25-26.

---

[57] *See* Appendix A-1.

[58] While the majority of our discussion will focus on the plans submitted by the Governor and the Republican Party, we note the same analysis can be applied to the plan proposed by the SRAC. That plan proposed a deviation 2.74 percent, which in the opinion of this Court, is pushing the outer limits of the *de minimis* standard. In addition, the same maladies that afflict the Governor's plan and Republican Party's plan, i.e. splitting county lines, splitting precinct lines, afflict the SRAC plan. As for S. 1003 and the Lt. Governor's plan, we conclude the

(Continued on following page)

As stated earlier, a non-exhaustive list of state policies, which have historically served to justify *de minimis* deviations and can also serve to distinguish among three constitutionally acceptable plans, includes protection of county or political subdivision lines, compactness, contiguity, recognition of historical boundaries, and protection of constituent representative relations. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 419; *Meier*, 420 U.S. at 23. *See also Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 740; *Swann v. Adams*, 385 U.S. 440 (1967); *Anne Arundel County Republican Central Committee v. State Advisory Board of Elections*, 781 F.Supp. 394 (D.Md. 1991).

The only cognizable state policy the court considered was the preservation of county lines as discussed supra pages 13 to 15. There are, for our purposes, two types of county line cuts: those which are necessary to meet population requirements and those which are not, which we define as "excess" cuts. An example of the former can be found in the court's plan for Pickens County. This County is entitled to 1.2 senate districts.[59] Thus, the County cannot remain whole. Approximately 18,000 people in Pickens County must be placed in a district laying in large part outside of the county. An example of an unnecessary cut can be found in the Republican Party's plan for Spartanburg County. Spartanburg has a population of 226,780 and is therefore ideally suited for three senate

---

(Continued from previous page)

deviations proposed are outside the *de minimis* standard that the court must satisfy and the parties did not convincingly justify this departure at trial.

[59] Pickens County has a population of 93,894, which divided by the ideal senate district of 75,798 equals 1.2.

districts. All districts could be drawn intracounty thus avoiding altogether any county line cuts. By comparison, the Republican Party splits Spartanburg County into four senate districts, thereby creating a cut in the county line. For purposes of evaluating compliance with this state policy, we calculated the actual number of districts proposed in a certain county, then subtracted the minimum number of districts which could have been drawn had approximate population equality alone been considered. The excess, or remainder represents an unnecessary intrusion against a county line. This methodology was used consistently throughout all of the legislative plans considered by the court.

Turning to the specific plans, the Governor's plan has 52 excess county line cuts while the Republican Party's plan has 56. By stark contrast, our plan contains only 30 such cuts. Clearly we serve the state's policy better than the other two plans. As for compactness and contiguity we find our plan serves these policies as well as, if not better, than the Governor's plan or the Republican Party's plan and we find our plan protects the state's established communities of interest better than the Governor or the Republican Party.

For a particularly egregious example of the Governor's and the Republican Party's disregard for county lines and communities of interest, we look to their District 10. This proposed district stretches from Anderson County to Aiken County, nearly one hundred road miles away. Along the way, it cuts into seven counties to garner black voters, and consolidates three insular and historical

communities of interest; all to create, ostensibly, a majority black district. It seems inconsequential to the proposing parties that the urbanites of Anderson County would be grouped with the rural communities of Abbeville County or that the pulpwood farmers of McCormick County would share representation with the industrial workers of Aiken County. The only cognizable community of interest in this proposed district is the black race. And while there was testimony at trial that blackness alone constitutes a community of interest sufficient to justify a district as contorted as this one, we categorically reject this assertion as overtly racist.[60]

On a related matter, the court's plan splits only 49 precinct lines, while the Governor's plan splits 122 and the Republican Party's plan splits 144. We note that while primarily an issue which effects administrative convenience, splitting precincts also has the effect of confusing both voters and potential voters; thus, in some instances, serving to abridge the right to vote or to have their vote counted. *Cf. Reynolds,* 377 U.S. at 555.

Although protecting constituent-representative relations may be a legitimate concern for a legislative body

---

[60] In *Carstens,* 543 F.Supp. at 91, the court defined a community of interest as "distinctive units which share common concerns with respect to *one or more* identifiable features such as geography, demography, ethnicity, culture, socio-economic status, or trade." (emphasis added). While this definition is helpful, we believe a community of interest is broader than race alone or economic status alone; rather it is an amalgamation of sometimes amorphous qualities best understood when considered on a backdrop of time. *See supra* note 48 and accompanying text.

fashioning a plan, *Burns v. Richardson*, 384 U.S. 73, 89 n. 16 (1966), this court must act circumspectly and without taint of arbitrariness. *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. at 415. We were therefore concerned with the apparent partisan considerations in certain plans.[61] In sum, there is nothing in either the Governor's plan or the Republican Party's plan to suggest even a casual observance of South Carolina's traditional and legitimate policies.

In addition to the preeminent goal of "substantial population equality," the court must also take care that its plan has neither the purpose nor effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on the basis of race. *See McDaniel*, 452 U.S. at 14849. To assess this, the Supreme Court employs a "retrogression" test. *See supra* pages 24-31. As stated earlier, this court viewed retrogression with respect to the plans as a whole and only secondarily to the retrogressive effects on a district by district basis.

Between 1980 and 1990 black population in South Carolina increased in real numbers from 948,623 to 1,039,884 but decreased in the percentage it constitutes of the total population from 30.38 percent to 29.82 percent. More pertinent, the 10 majority black districts, provided under the 1984 plan, lost a cumulative population total of

---

[61] For example, the Governor's plan pits ten incumbent Democratic senators against one another. We also note that at trial several parties chided the Senate for proposing an "incumbent protection plan." Since 1984, when the Senate last drew a plan for itself, only 14 out of 46 senators remain. It seems safe to conclude that the means by which incumbents have sought to protect themselves have been historically ineffective.

92,744.[62] Losing population is a phenomenon which affects districts other than those which are majority black[63] and we specifically find the demographic changes in South Carolina's majority black districts are wholly unrelated to the representation provided; rather the changes are indicative of a general movement away from urban and rural areas to suburban and resort areas.

That we understand why the natural changes occur does not make the task of avoiding a diminution in black voting strength any easier. Many of the majority black districts in South Carolina are contiguous and this makes enhancement problematic, unless one forgoes all other considerations.

---

[62]

Dist.	Population Deviation From Mean (75,798) in real numbers.
7	-13,490
19	+ 5,519
21	-13,561
30	-13,297
32	-12,174
36	- 8,952
39	- 9,451
40	- 9,595
42	-18,471
45	+ 728
	-92,744

[63] For perspective, from 1987 to 1988, over 40 million Americans, or 17.6 percent of the total population, moved households. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, p. 19, Table 25 (111th ed. 1991). Over a third of those moved to a different county. *See Freeman v. Pitts*, ___ S.Ct. ___, 60 LW 4286, 4294 (Decided March 31, 1992).

The court's plan, despite the demographic changes, creates one additional majority black district, enhances several existing ones, and when considered as a whole clearly "d[oes] not increase the degree of discrimination against blacks"[64] in this State. Therefore, our plan is not retrogressive. *See Appendix A-1.*

The court's plan contains 10 districts with voting age populations greater than 50 percent as compared to the 1984 plan which had 7 such districts and has 9 districts using the 1990 census figures. Using total population, the court's plan creates 11 majority black districts, including a new District 17 which was heretofore not an equal opportunity district for black candidates.[65] As evidenced by the chart below, the court's plan enhances the other majority black districts where demography and practicability allow. We note again that a district by district enhancement is not constitutionally mandated.

---

[64] *City of Lockhart v. United States,* 460 U.S. at 134.

[65] This new district has a total black population of 55.25 percent and a black voting age population of 51.62 percent. Since it was alleged by all parties that there is no incumbent running in the area of District 17, we conclude a 51.62 percent black voting age population clearly represents an opportunity for the black majority to elect the candidate of their choice.

	Court's Plan 1990 data		1984 Plan 1980 data		1984 Plan 1990 data		Changes in[66] 1992 Plan	
Dist.	% Black	% VAP	% Black	% VAP	% Black	% VAP	% Black	% VAP
7	51.90	47.74	50.23	45.31	52.35	48.15	-0.45	-0.41
17	55.25	51.62	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	68.51	64.73	58.75	54.48	56.47	53.90	9.76	10.26
21	54.37	50.01	50.83	48.04	54.30	50.86	0.07	-0.85
30	61.02	56.73	59.30	55.51	58.34	54.61	1.72	1.22
32	62.49	57.81	58.15	53.90	59.85	55.15	2.64	2.66
36	63.67	59.92	63.24	59.15	62.51	58.61	0.43	0.77
39	59.97	55.66	59.18	55.25	60.39	56.51	-0.42	-0.85
40	54.02	51.49	50.69	48.20	54.06	51.90	-0.04	-0.41
42	59.60	54.43	59.13	53.54	63.28	57.02	-3.68	-2.59
45	58.91	54.95	54.60	50.53	55.02	50.88	3.89	4.07

Of particular interest to the court was District 7, in Greenville County. District 7 elected a black, Senator Theo Mitchell, in 1984 with a total black population ("TOP") of 50.23 percent and a BVAP of 45.31 percent. Senator Mitchell has served continuously since 1984. District 7 decreased in population by 13,490 or 17.80 percent of the district from 1980 to 1990. In addition, this district is completely surrounded by majority white districts, making enhancement difficult.[67] Consequently both the

---

[66] To calculate the percent increase in black total population (TOP) and voting age population (BVAP), we took whichever was higher between the 1980 figure and the 1990 figure.

[67] Only one plan submitted (Governor's plan) provided a higher TOP or BVAP for this district than our plan and not only was the enhancement minimal it was achieved only by splitting numerous precincts. This Court concludes the perils of splitting precincts, in this instance, outweighed the slight enhancement proposed.

TOP and BVAP percentages are lower in our plan than the 1984 plan using 1990 figures; nevertheless, the minority population of this District still has a fair chance to elect the candidate of their choice. In fact, Senator Mitchell himself supported S. 1003, which provided District 7 with TOP of 50.95 percent and a BVAP of 46.84 percent, clearly less than what the court has provided.

Drawing Districts 39 and 40 proved especially problematic for the court. As the court's map shows, District 40, which lost 9,595 people, is contiguous with District 39, which lost 9,451. Under the 1984 plan using 1990 figures, District 39 had a robust TOP of 60.39 percent and BVAP of 56.51 percent. Considering its loss of population, however, District 39 needed black population added in a proportion relatively equal to that under the 1984 plan using 1990 numbers to avoid a decrease in percentage numbers and to meet the *de minimis* standard. Unfortunately, District 40, which under the 1984 plan using 1990 numbers had a TOP of 54.06 percent and a BVAP of 51.90 percent and is represented by a white, obviously had little black population to provide. So, the court, given the significant limitations caused by natural retrogression coupled with the geographics of the region, equalized the unavoidable decreases in Districts 39 and 40 rather than sacrifice one to avoid any decrease at all in the other.[68] Therefore, the court's plan strikes the proper balance

---

[68] All plans but the SRAC plan proposed decreases in BVAP percent in District 39 when compared with 1984 plan using 1990 numbers, while three of the five plans proposed in BVAP percent in District 40 using the same data. Again, the Governor and the Republican Party split numerous precincts to achieve their respective marginal enhancements.

between the various interests arising in this type of proceeding, including equality of population in districts, racial fairness, and maintenance of the South Carolina's political subdivisions and communities of interest.

B

House of Representatives

The South Carolina House of Representatives is composed of 124 single-member districts. S.C. Const., Art. III, § 3. Representatives serve two-year terms. S.C. Const., Art. III, § 2. The last redistricting of the House occurred incident to the 1980 census. Those districts were enacted into law in 1981 and precleared by the United States Justice Department. This districting scheme has never been successfully challenged under § 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

As stipulated by the parties, the current House districts are constitutionally deficient because of disparities in population among the districts. According to the 1990 census, the ideal House district should contain a total population of 28,118.57 persons. The total deviation from this norm under the 1981 House plan is 113.86 percent. District 106 in Horry County, a resort area, has 76.76 percent more population than an ideal district using 1990 census data. District 109, in Charleston County, has 37.09 percent less population than an ideal district. An examination of the 1981 plan districts using 1990 data shows generally that there have been strong population gains in suburban and resort areas of the state and declining populations in inner-city and rural areas of the state.

In effectuating the constitutional state policy of preserving county boundaries to the extent possible given federal constitutional and statutory requirements, the 1981 plan made 17 "excess" cuts in county lines. *See* text, supra, p. 59 for discussion of an "excess" cut. Twenty-nine total districts extended across county lines, with 20 districts falling within two counties, seven falling within three counties, and two falling within four counties.

As noted earlier, *supra*, note 34, the 1981 plan, as originally drawn, contained 26 districts where blacks constituted a majority of the total population in that district and 20 districts with a majority black voting age population. At present, using 1990 census data, the number of such seats has declined to 24 total population majority districts but increased to 21 majority black voting age districts due to natural retrogression.[69]

The plan now implemented by the court as an interim remedy addresses the constitutional infirmities of the old plan while giving due deference to established state policies, particularly the state constitutional policy of preserving the integrity of county boundaries. *Weiser*, 412 U.S. at 795. Given the substantial population deficits in the more rural areas of the state and population surpluses in the suburban and resort areas of the state, close

---

[69] One district, 93, lost a majority black voting age population. Two districts, 59 and 122, gained voting age population between 51-52 percent, but were 12.09 percent and 4.38 percent short of population, respectively. One district, 109, went from a 48.55 percent black voting age population to 65.16 percent but was 37.09 percent short of population from the ideal district. *See supra* note 34.

adherence to the old district boundaries, the last explicit expression of state policy with respect to the districting of the House, is not feasible or necessarily possible. *Cf. Upham v. Seamon,* 456 U.S. 37 (1982)(permitting adjustments to boundaries only to the extent necessary to remedy violation); *Reilly,* 533 F.Supp. at 1181 (same).

The court's plan has a total deviation of 1.98 percent. District 14, covering southern Laurens County and northern Abbeville and Greenwood Counties, is .99 percent short of ideal population, or 279 persons. District 123, comprised chiefly of the Hilton Head area of Beaufort County, is .99 percent over ideal population, or 279 persons. This deviation is legally *de minimis;* therefore, the constitutional requirement of one man, one vote implicit in the Fourteenth Amendment is satisfied. *Chapman,* 420 U.S. at 22, 26-27; *see supra,* pages 17 to 24.

The court's plan is not retrogressive. Twenty-three of the districts in the court's plan contain a black voting-age population majority as opposed to the 1981 plan at present (21) or when drawn (20).[70] This represents a two district increase over the 1981 plan as it presently exists or a three district increase over the 1981 plan as originally enacted by the General Assembly and approved by the Justice Department. The court's plan also contains a total of 28 districts with black total population majorities.

---

[70] When military populations are subtracted from the following districts the BVAP increases as follows in certain districts: District 70 – 64.01 percent; District 109 – 55.57 percent; and District 122 – 54.38 percent. This would create an additional district with a BVAP above 50 percent for a total of twenty-four districts.

Because "the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise" under the court's plan is enhanced over the position with respect to the previous plan, the court's plan satisfies § 5's retrogression standard. *Beer*, 425 U.S. at 142; *see supra*, pages 24 to 31.

To the extent possible, the court's plan also attempts to honor the express state policy of preserving county boundaries in the creation of election districts. The court's plan contains 20 "excess" cuts in county boundaries. *See supra*, pages 13 to 15. Of the 124 districts in the court's plan, 38 lie in two or more counties as follows: 29 (two counties); 7 (three counties); 2 (four counties). These figures reflect only a slight increase over the figures presented in the 1981 plan.

Of the plans submitted to the court for consideration, the plans of SRAC, the Republican Party, House Speaker Sheheen's Revised 2, and the Governor also contained de minimis total population variations among the districts.[71] Each of these plans created a larger number of black majority districts than the plan now adopted by the court.[72] Each plan throws all consideration of the state policy of recognizing county lines to the wind, however.

---

[71] SRAC – 1.952 percent; Republican Party 0.18 percent; Governor 0.98 percent; Sheheen 1.998 percent. The House-passed plan had a deviation of almost 10 percent and was not, therefore, considered by the court as an acceptable alternative for implementation by the court.

[72] SRAC – 32 (TOP), 32 (BVAP); Republican Party – 36 (TOP), 33 (BVAP); Governor – 35 (TOP), 33 (BVAP); Sheheen – 29 (TOP), 21 (BVAP).

Each plan, with the exception of Speaker Sheheen's plan, however, also seeks the imprimatur of the court upon the elimination of house incumbents to suit the sponsoring party's political purpose, i.e. the Republican Party and the Governor appear to seek to eliminate Democrats and the SRAC appears to seek to eliminate incumbents because of their race.

As to county lines, each of the four proposed plans make the following "excess" cuts in county lines: Republican Party (40); Governor (38); Sheheen (37); and SRAC (48). The number of districts lying in two or more counties in each of the plans is as follows:

	Republican	Governor	SRAC	Sheheen
Two Counties	28	33	34	36
Three Counties	16	12	9	10
Four Counties	1	1	6	2
Five Counties	1	1	3	1
Total	46	48	52	49

As to incumbency, three plans pit the following numbers of incumbents against one another:

(a) Republican Party – six sets of Democrats (two individuals are allegedly retiring); 1 set of Republicans; and 2 sets of mixed Republican and Democratic incumbents.

(b) Governor – eight sets of Democrats (two individuals are allegedly retiring); 1 set of Republicans; and 2 sets of mixed Republican and Democratic incumbents.

(c) SRAC – 19 sets of white incumbent representatives and one set with one black and one white incumbent, including eight pairs of Democrats, five pairs of Republicans, and 7 mixed political pairs (one incumbent is not running and two are allegedly retiring).

Each of these plans has an acceptable total deviation; all three contain a deviation below that found in the court's plan and Speaker Sheheen's plan is only slightly higher. None of the plans retrogress under § 5 standards. Unlike the parties, however, this court is not free to impose a particular political or racial agenda upon the state.[73] The court must, as a court of equity, remedy the constitutional deficiencies of the current plan with due deference to express state policies. The court's plan, we believe, achieves the proper balance between drawing districts of equal population, recognizing concentrations of black voters, and giving effect to current state policy respecting the redistricting process and avoiding the "political thicket" that arises in pitting large numbers of incumbents against one another.

As discussed in part III above, § 2 of the Voting Rights Act looks to the effects or intent of a specific plan. Where, as here, there have been no elections under the court's plan, assessment of the "results" of such plan is

---

[73] *See supra* p. 62. In the ten years since the House was last redistricted, the people have only retained approximately 31 of 124 representatives who sat in House when the 1981 plan was adopted. Over half of the current representatives were elected to the House after 1984. As noted at trial, the defendant Robert Sheheen, Speaker of the House and a 15-year veteran of the House, only narrowly won reelection in 1990.

speculative. We have, however, consistent with the guidelines set forth in Part III, reviewed the court's plan and conclude that it contains no obvious violations of § 2. The districts drawn by the court recognize those concentrations of black population in the state that are sufficiently large and geographically compact to form a majority in a single member district. In so drawing districts, the court was cognizant that there is no duty to maximize the number of black majority districts in the state or insure proportional representation on the basis of race. 42 U.S.C. § 1973.

The court concludes that the balance struck in its plan is the appropriate balance. While other plans create a larger number of black districts, they do so without regard to any interest but race and without the clear necessity which justifies a § 2 remedy. A brief discussion of some aspects of the other plans proposing a greater number of black majority districts illustrates this point.

The House plan proposed by the Republican Party, containing 36 majority black districts using total population, represents an attempt to achieve proportional representation on the basis of race, a result specifically not dictated by any federal or state law.[74] *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1973 ("nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population"). Thus, the Republican plan draws lines without regard to any factor except skin color and possibly political affiliation. As previously noted, the

---

[74] Thirty-six of the 124 seats in the House represents 29.03 percent of the House membership. 29.82 percent of the total population of South Carolina is black.

Republican plan shows little regard for traditional state political units such as the county. The plan also divides numerous smaller municipalities and towns into separate districts.

Proposed District 55 in the Republican plan is illustrative. The town of Cheraw, in Chesterfield County, one of that county's largest towns, is divided and part of the town is placed in District 55 which chiefly lies in northern Marlboro County across the Great Pee Dee River. The southern boundary line of the district also divides the town of Bennettsville, the county seat of Marlboro County, placing part of the town in District 55 and another part in proposed District 54. At its eastern end, approximately 50 road miles from Cheraw at the western end, District 55 embraces a piece of the town of Dillon, the county seat of Dillon County, the third county contained within the district. Despite all the slicing and splicing of towns and counties, the district created by the Republican plan only has a total black population of 52.98 percent and a black voting age population of 50.74 percent, numbers barely sufficient to characterize the district as a majority minority district. The Republican district, composed of fractions of three counties and three towns, has no demonstrated cohesiveness. There is no evidence showing that political ties exist between the communities incorporated in the district. Each elects its own councils and school boards.

The Governor's plan, with 35 districts, suffers from the same defect.[75] Though not as egregious in its splintering and splicing tendencies in the Marlboro County area, the Governor's proposed District 54 also divides the towns of Cheraw and Bennettsville and spans parts of two counties, Chesterfield and Marlboro, yet only achieves a district with a 52.22 percent total black population and 49.89 percent black voting age population.

Finally, the plan presented by the SRAC, containing 32 proposed majority minority districts, does not attempt, to the degree of the other plans, to create proportional representation. Nonetheless, the plan suffers some of the same infirmities as the other plans.

Proposed District 105 in the SRAC plan lies wholly within Horry County. With no apparent purpose other than capturing as many black persons in Horry County as possible within a closed area, the district starts near the northwestern corner of the county and runs in a thin, snaking line back and forth across the county, ending at the southern end of the county. The proposed district embraces several distinct rural areas of the county, the town of Loris in the northern part of the county, parts of the resort area, particularly around Myrtle Beach and the Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, and parts of the town of Conway, the county seat. One would be hard pressed to

---

[75] The similarity in methodology between the plan of the defendant Governor and the plaintiff Republican Party is hardly surprising. Mark Elam, a member of the Governor's staff, prepared both plans and testified on behalf of both plans though the parties were, ostensibly, on opposite sides of the case.

draw a district which more effectively splits communities of interest in a county and raised skin color to the sole criteria for boundary drawing. Geographical compactness and cohesion is particularly important in a House district which is naturally smaller and less diverse than, for example, a congressional district. The lack of reasonable geographic compactness demonstrated by the bizarre shape of the district and the lack of any distinct community of interest, apart from race, which would demonstrate district cohesiveness, indicate to the court that no § 2 violation arises by failing to include such a district in the court's plan.

In summary, given the nature of this proceeding, the evidence, and the law, the court is satisfied that its plan satisfies the requirements of the Voting Rights Act. The court's plan strikes the proper balance between the various interests arising in this type of proceeding, including equality of population in districts, racial fairness, and maintenance of the state's political subdivisions and communities of interest.

C

Congressional Plan

As mentioned previously, the parties stipulated the current congressional districts are malapportioned if the 1990 census data is applied to the current plan. In keeping with the principle of one man, one vote, a properly apportioned district would have 581,117 individuals. As a result, the deviation of the current plan using 1990 data is

8.33 percent, which is unacceptable. The parties submitted a total of nine plans for the court to consider.[76]

As discussed above, the court developed its plan consistent with the following factors: 1) the extent to which the plans proposed and the plans adopted are

---

[76] In addition to the plans set forth below, the SRAC proposed a plan on the next to the last day of the proceedings, the Speaker submitted an additional plan and the Amicus presented a draft of a plan. The SRAC intended to offer a "compromise plan" on behalf of itself, the Senate, and the Lt. Governor; however, Governor Campbell and Congressman Tallon objected to the introduction of this plan on the basis of timeliness and this objection was sustained. The SRAC was permitted to proffer testimony on this plan at the conclusion of the Congressional phase.

Although the Speaker filed a prior plan on behalf of the House, which did not include a majority-minority district, we have focused on the plan subsequently ratified by the House and which was advocated at trial by the Speaker.

As for the plan of the Amicus, although the court has considered the general theories espoused in the plan, detailed geographical data for the plan was not available. Finally, the Republican Party did not present a Congressional plan at trial, but rather adopted the Governor's plan. The salient features of each plan are set forth below:

Plan	% Deviation	Split Counties	Split VTDs
Court	0	13	5
Governor	0	17	14
House	.13	11	0
SRAC	.15	29	0
Tallon	.21	7	0
Senate	.25	25	1
Lt. Gov.	.36	14	1

consistent with the retrogression standard set forth in *Beer* and *City of Lockhart*; 2) the extent to which reasonably compact and contiguous majority black districts were and could be drawn; 3) the extent to which the minority group is politically cohesive; 4) the extent to which racially polarized voting patterns exist; 5) the extent to which the lines which have been drawn limit the number of majority-black single-member districts in light of the expressed state policies of the State of South Carolina.

Based on these factors, two important considerations emerge. First, to what extent does the court's plan comport with the more stringent equal population requirement required for congressional districts? Second, to what extent does the court's plan draw reasonably compact and contiguous black districts?

As stated previously, *Karcher* sets forth a two-pronged inquiry for assessing any variation in districts from a standard of equality: (1) Does a plan represent a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population, and (2) Is any "significant" variance between districts necessary to achieve some legitimate state goal? *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 731. The court's plan clearly comports with the stringent equal population requirements set forth in *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 731. As indicated in the table, *see supra*, note 76, with the exception of the Governor's plan, the court's plan is the only plan with a zero deviation. The other plans proffered to the court have deviations ranging from .15 to .36 percent. Since the court has developed a plan which achieves zero percent deviation, we decide neither the extent to which the deviations of the

other plans may be considered *de minimis* nor the validity of their justifications for their deviations.

The second point we address is the creation of a majority-minority district. Every plan submitted created a black majority district. While the parties disagreed as to the particular shape of such a district, all of the state policymakers – the House, the Senate and the Governor – agreed that such a district should be drawn. *Carstens*, 543 F.Supp. at 79. As a result, the record before the court is devoid of any argument that a majority-minority district should not be created and our decision today is bound by the record developed at trial. Given the lack of an adversarial proceeding in this regard, we do not decide if the court was *required*, under existing legal principles, to create a majority-minority district. Nevertheless, based on the criteria set forth above, the court devised a plan which created a majority-minority district.

First, as stated in *Beer*, "[t]he purpose of § 5 has always been to insure that no voting-procedure changes would be made that would lead to retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise." *Id.* at 141. By establishing a black majority district, the court has enhanced "the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise," *Beer*, 425 U.S. at 142, and has satisfied the retrogression standard set forth in *Beer*, *Id.*, and *City of Lockhart*, 460 U.S. at 134.

Having decided that creating a black majority district would satisfy retrogression considerations, we next looked to the extent to which a reasonably compact and contiguous majority black district could be drawn. The

record sets forth the general concentration of black population which runs in a crescent from South Carolina's southwestern border with Georgia through the midlands to the coast in Georgetown County. *See* Brief of *Amicus Curiae* Katharine I. Butler at 9. This crescent does not follow county lines. *Id.* As a result, any black majority district would have to encompass this area. Further, to achieve an effective opportunity for blacks to elect a candidate of their choice, the district had to include those portions of the Charleston and Columbia metropolitan areas with high concentrations of minority voters. By including the Charleston and Columbia metropolitan areas within the black-majority district, the court was able to create a district which has a 57.9 percent black voting age population.

Though we acknowledge that the resulting districts may stretch the concept of compactness, especially in light of the intrusion into the Charleston and Columbia metropolitan areas, we cannot say that the districts do not comport with the flexible approach to compactness advocated by the court in *Dillard, supra.* First, and foremost, the creation of a majority-minority district itself "aids and facilitates the political process" by assuring compliance with the retrogression standard of *Beer. See Dillard,* 686 F. Supp. at 1465. Second, the testimony at trial was sufficient to indicate that the district would be manageable from the standpoint of constituent services.[77] Finally,

---

[77] In this regard, we note the testimony of Ms. Smalls, who is the chief of staff for Congressman Tallon and administers his local offices. Ms. Smalls testified that the black majority district created in Congressman Tallon's plan would be manageable.

(Continued on following page)

there is no indication from the record that the impact on the surrounding districts would impair the effective representation of those districts. Thus, in the context of congressional districts, we cannot say that the creation of a majority-minority district would violate the compactness requirement set forth in *Gingles*.

As for the existence of racial bloc voting and political cohesion, by encompassing the crescent of black population within the black-majority district, the court's plan accounts for these considerations to the extent they exist. Finally, the court's plan acknowledges South Carolina's specific state policy of maintaining the integrity of county lines. S.C. Const. Art. VII, § 13; *See supra* pages 13 to 15. The plan developed by the court only splits 13. county lines.[78] Though other plans may split fewer counties, these plans do not have as low a deviation as the court's plan. The court only split county lines when it was necessary to achieve a minimum variation or to increase the percentage of black population within the majority-minority district consistent with the non-retrogression principles of Beer as set forth above.

Based on the foregoing, the plan created by the court satisfies the important principles of one man, one vote and is consistent with the requirements of the Voting

---

(Continued from previous page)

The court's plan, which is no less compact, would be similarly manageable.

[78] As a practical matter, five county cuts were necessary to achieve minimal variance. Any remaining cuts were made to enhance black population within the districts. *See supra* page 59.

Rights Act. No other plan has a lower deviation and splits fewer counties than the court created plan.

V

CONCLUSION

Much has changed in South Carolina since 1984 and even more since 1980. One thing that has not changed is the General Assembly's inability to redistrict without judicial intervention or at least prodding. The General Assembly knew the census was coming, correctly predicted malapportionment, and had both sophisticated software and capable operators in place to draw plans. Nevertheless, no compromise was ever reached with the Governor's office and this court was called upon to perform a task that all concede is most properly a legislative one. As set forth more fully above, the duties of a legislature and a federal court are not the same. While we certainly can consider significant state policies, we have less latitude to serve those policies than a state legislature would enjoy.

Since the General Assembly and the Governor did not fulfill their obligations, and the plans proposed at trial suffered an array of infirmities, reluctant as we were, this court unabashedly fashioned its own plans. Our plans meet the *de minimis* standards of *Chapman*, the deviation standard of *Karcher*, and the retrogression standard of *Beer* as applicable to each plan. In addition the plans protect the traditional and legitimate policies of South Carolina. It is our hope that the General Assembly and the Governor will work together and fashion acceptable plans. In the interim, these are the plans for the

South Carolina Senate, House of Representatives and the United States Congressional districts.

IT IS ORDERED, therefore, that the redistricting plans for the South Carolina Senate [Appendix A], South Carolina House of Representatives [Appendix B], and the South Carolina Congressional delegation [Appendix C] shall be the lawful election districts for each of those bodies for the general elections scheduled in 1992,[79] and for all subsequent elections until redistricting plans for those bodies are lawfully enacted by the South Carolina General Assembly, signed by the Governor, and approved by the United States Department of Justice pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the claim of plaintiffs Bufort Blanton, et. al, C.A. No. 3:91-3635-1, regarding the constitutionality of the county delegation system is deconsolidated from this action and referred to a single judge of the district court for resolution. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 42(b). As to all other claims in the consolidated cases, the interim plans of the court stand as the final judgment of the court as to those claims. We expressly find no just reason for delay; therefore, final judgment shall be entered with respect to all remaining claims. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 54(b).

---

[79] By order entered March 6, 1992, the court directed that the filing dates for the bodies covered by our plans would run from June 1- June 25, 1992; primary elections would be held August 25, 1992; run-off primary elections, if necessary, would be held September 8, 1992; and certification of candidates to the election commissioners would occur on September 18, 1992.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 1st day of May, 1992, at Columbia, South Carolina.

/s/ Clyde H. Hamilton
CLYDE H. HAMILTON,
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT
JUDGE, FOURTH CIRCUIT
COURT OF APPEALS

/s/ Falcon B. Hawkins
FALCON B. HAWKINS,
CHIEF UNITED STATES
DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

/s/ G. Ross Anderson, Jr.
G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGE, DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

H - 1

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

Population Summary Report

Dist.	Total	Black	Pct. Black	Total18+	Black18+	Pct. Black18+	Pct. Dev.
1	76,341	7,193	9.42	60,456	5,259	8.70	0.72
2	75,047	4,684	6.24	56,096	3,345	5.96	-0.99
3	76,324	14,994	19.65	58,120	10,297	17.72	0.69
4	75,838	10,681	14.08	56,295	7,288	12.95	0.05
5	76,379	7,173	9.39	57,633	4,847	8.41	0.77
6	75,758	3,954	5.22	57,530	2,601	4.52	-0.05
7	75,054	38,951	51.90	55,013	26,265	47.74	-0.98
8	75,872	6,400	8.44	58,706	4,484	7.64	0.10
9	75,196	17,554	23.34	55,801	12,170	21.81	-0.79
10	76,463	23,975	31.36	56,761	15,984	28.16	0.88
11	75,276	24,859	33.02	56,054	16,809	29.99	-0.69
12	75,834	11,322	14.93	57,416	7,702	13.41	0.05
13	75,690	10,690	14.12	57,463	7,495	13.04	-0.14
14	75,941	13,495	17.77	56,392	8,851	15.70	0.19
15	75,396	8,847	11.73	56,694	6,134	10.82	-0.53
16	75,040	16,973	22.62	55,291	11,076	20.03	-1.00
17	76,506	42,267	55.25	54,143	27,951	51.62	0.93
18	75,178	22,655	30.14	56,173	15,192	27.05	-0.82
19	76,041	52,097	68.51	55,561	35,967	64.73	0.32
20	76,371	17,970	23.53	60,645	12,897	21.27	0.76
21	76,516	41,602	54.37	58,367	29,187	50.01	0.95
22	76,212	15,559	20.42	56,364	10,139	17.99	0.55
23	75,265	5,434	7.22	54,337	3,693	6.80	-0.70
24	75,276	12,647	16.80	54,999	8,351	15.18	-0.69
25	75,915	27,713	36.51	55,260	18,616	33.69	0.15
26	76,127	12,620	16.58	56,353	8,217	14.58	0.43
27	75,509	23,980	31.76	55,047	16,138	29.32	-0.38
28	75,928	20,254	26.68	55,841	12,778	22.88	0.17
29	75,927	32,229	42.45	54,474	21,170	38.86	0.17
30	75,725	46,207	61.02	52,178	29,599	56.73	-0.10
31	76,171	17,628	23.14	55,458	11,161	20.13	0.49
32	75,855	47,405	62.49	51,246	29,625	57.81	0.08
33	75,304	7,959	10.57	58,747	5,106	8.69	-0.65
34	75,850	27,948	36.85	51,458	17,372	33.76	0.07
35	75,746	24,746	32.67	54,375	16,384	30.13	-0.07
36	75,397	48,006	63.67	52,727	31,594	59.92	-0.53
37	76,141	22,509	29.56	53,724	15,051	28.02	0.45
38	76,487	10,070	13.17	52,119	6,355	12.19	0.91
39	75,933	45,539	59.97	53,160	29,589	55.66	0.18
40	76,379	41,263	54.02	54,953	28,295	51.49	0.77
41	75,940	9,348	12.31	57,440	6,001	10.45	0.19
42	75,081	44,750	59.60	55,299	30,098	54.43	-0.95
43	75,888	26,467	34.88	57,328	17,454	30.45	0.12
44	75,258	9,176	12.19	57,387	6,137	10.69	-0.71
45	75,817	44,667	58.91	52,684	28,948	54.95	0.03
46	75,511	17,424	23.07	56,928	11,368	19.97	-0.38
	3,486,703	1039884		2566496	691,040		-0.01

Mean Deviation is: 367
Mean Percent Deviation is: 0.48

Largest Positive Deviation is: 718 0.95 Percent
Largest Negative Deviation is: -758 -1.00 Percent

Overall Range in Deviation is: 1,476 1.95 Percent

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 1

Area	**Population**
Oconee County	57,494
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CALHOUN	3,672
CLEMSON	2,554
PIKE	755
STONE CHURCH	
Tract 0112.02	
Blocks: 156A, 156B, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162A, 162B, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191	129
Tract 0112.03	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215A, 215B, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321A, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 403A, 406A, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419A, 419B, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428	2,497
UNIVERSITY	9,240
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,341
PERCENT VARIATION	0.716

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 2

Area	Population
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALBERT R. LEWIS	2,027
AMBLER	1,493
ARIAL MILL	3,052
BRUSHY CREEK	1,699
CEDAR ROCK	990
CENTRAL 1	2,483
CENTRAL 2	2,058
CROSSWELL	2,611
DACUSVILLE	3,962
EASLEY	3,687
FLAT ROCK	1,964
FOREST ACRES	4,034
GEORGES CREEK	1,276
HOLLY SPRINGS	1,437
LAWRENCE CHAPEL	719
LIBERTY 1	3,428
LIBERTY 2	1,398
MCKISSICK	2,613
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1,218
NORRIS	1,994
PARK STREET	5,011
PICKENS 1	3,617
PICKENS 2	2,588
PICKENS 3	3,675
POWDERSVILLE	3,211
PRATERS CREEK	1,265
PUMPKINTOWN	1,492
RICES CREEK	1,290
SIX MILE	3,368
SMITH GROVE	2,202

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 2

Area	Population
STONE CHURCH	
Tract 0112.02	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203	0
ZION	3,185
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,047
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.991

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area	Population
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
APPLETON EQUINOX	2,142
CENTERVILLE	5,348
CORNER	335
DENVER SANDY SPRINGS	2,054
EDGEWOOD	3,626
FIVE FORKS	1,346
FLATROCK	2,066
FORK 1	816
FORK 2	1,292
GLUCK MILL	469
GREEN POND	3,989
GROVE SCHOOL	301
HAMMOND SCHOOL	
Tract 0003.00	
Blocks: 201C, 202B	6

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area	Population
HOMELAND PARK	
Tract 0118.00	
Blocks: 107, 118, 119, 138	77
Tract 0119.00	
Blocks: 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 327, 328, 329, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417	1,618
HOPEWELL	2,518
IVA	2,468
JACKSON MILL	1,285
LA FRANCE	630
LAKESIDE	3,433
MOUNT TABOR	1,723
MOUNTAIN CREEK	1,745
ORR MILL	2,354
PENDLETON	4,112
ROCK MILL	2,059
STARR	910
TOWNVILLE	555
VARENNES	2,820
WARD 1 PRECINCT 1	2,559
WARD 1 PRECINCT 2	1,708
WARD 2 PRECINCT 1	1,971
WARD 2 PRECINCT 2	
Tract 0002.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 508, 509, 510, 512, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 528, 529, 530, 531, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 607, 608, 609, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 712	1,694

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area **Population**

Tract 0003.00

Blocks: 201B, 204, 205, 301A, 301B, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 402, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412A 1,788

Tract 0112.00

Blocks: 214A, 215A, 217A, 336A, 336B 139

WARD 3 PRECINCT 1 2,283

WARD 4 PRECINCT 1 2,089

WARD 4 PRECINCT 2 1,834

WARD 5 PRECINCT 1 1,150

WARD 5 PRECINCT 2 2,503

WARD 6 PRECINCT 1 2,767

WARD 6 PRECINCT 2 1,306

WEST SAVANNAH 436

DISTRICT TOTAL 76,324

PERCENT VARIATION 0.694

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area **Population**

Abbeville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BROADMOUTH 505

CENTRAL 269

COLD SPRINGS

Tract 9502.00

Blocks: 339, 340, 341, 342, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353 101

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area	Population
Tract 9504.00	
Blocks: 115, 116	10
DONALDS	717
DUE WEST	2,032
HALLS STORE	1,239
HAMPTON	37
HILLVILLE	361
KEOWEE	555
LEVEL LAND	432
ROCK SPRINGS	708
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BAKERS CREEK	306
BELTON	6,460
BISHOPS BRANCH	1,413
BOWLING GREEN	727
BROADVIEW	823
BROADWAY	2,485
BRUSHY CREEK	3,706
CEDAR GROVE	1,378
CHIQUOLA MILL	1,216
CONCRETE	4,660
CRAYTONVILLE	1,246
FRIENDSHIP	1,156
HALL	2,125
HAMMOND SCHOOL	
Tract 0003.00	
Blocks: 401, 404, 412B, 413	235
Tract 0004.00	
Blocks: 118B, 119	46

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area	Population
Tract 0011.00	
Blocks: 301B, 302A, 302B, 302C, 302D, 303A, 303B, 317, 318, 319	286
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 387	13
Tract 0112.00	
Blocks: 101, 126, 127, 128, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 201, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213B, 214B, 215B, 216, 217B, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 330, 331, 332, 333B, 334, 335	2,140
HIGH POINT	745
HOMELAND PARK	
Tract 0118.00	
Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 120, 123	535
Tract 0119.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 301, 302, 303, 304, 326, 331, 332, 401	2,137
HONEA PATH	2,424
MCADAMS	228
MELTON	562
NEALS CREEK	3,179
PELZER	1,537
PIEDMONT	1,201
PIERCETOWN	716
ROCK SPRING	988
SHIRLEYS STORE	905

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area	**Population**
SIMPSONVILLE	2,285
THREE AND TWENTY	3,981
TONEY CREEK	617
WALKER-MCELMOYLE	963
WARD 2 PRECINCT 2	
Tract 0011.00	
Blocks: 301A	2
Tract 0112.00	
Blocks: 213A, 333A	24
WARD 3 PRECINCT 2	2,366
WEST PELZER	2,625
WHITE PLAINS	2,612
WILLIAMSTON MILL	1,941
WILLIAMSTON	4,947
WRIGHTS SCHOOL	931
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,838
PERCENT VARIATION	0.053

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	**Population**
Greenville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALEXANDER	
Tract 0022.01	
Blocks: 413B, 414B, 501A, 501B, 506, 508, 509B, 509C, 712A, 712B, 713, 714	297

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	Population
Tract 0022.02	
Blocks: 402D, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 410, 412, 413, 414, 501A, 501B, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 622, 623, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712A, 712B	2,157
ARMSTRONG	1,542
BEREA	2,984
CHESTNUT HILLS	1,767
CITY VIEW	
Tract 0007.00	
Blocks: 401A	0
Tract 0022.01	
Blocks: 128, 129, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 401, 413A, 414A, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 507, 509A, 726A	1,273
Tract 0022.02	
Blocks: 401A, 402A, 409A	0
Tract 0023.03	
Blocks: 803, 804, 835	0
EBENEZER	1,827
FAIRVIEW	3,518
FROHAWK	2,931
GOWENSVILLE	1,736
GREER 1	1,440
GREER 2	1,340

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	Population
GREER 3	1,543
GREER 4	2,344
JENNINGS MILL	996
MARIDELL	2,795
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2,029
ONEAL	3,081
PLEASANT GROVE	
Tract 0025.03	
Blocks: 112, 113B, 116B, 118, 119A, 119B, 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206B, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419	2,342
Tract 0025.05	
Blocks: 507C, 802B, 802C, 804, 805B	0
SALUDA	1,885
SANDY FLAT	3,483
SKYLAND	2,753
SLATER MARIETTA	5,725
SULPHUR SPRINGS	
Tract 0037.02	
Blocks: 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 215, 230	2,179
TANGLEWOOD	3,849
TAYLORS	3,684
TIGERVILLE	1,934

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	Population
TRAVELERS REST	3,074
TUBBS MOUNTAIN	2,846
WELCOME	
Tract 0021.06	
Blocks: 722, 723	136
WESTCLIFFE	3,173
WESTSIDE	3,716
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,379
PERCENT VARIATION	0.767

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 6

Area	Population
Greenville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AVON	2,312
BATESVILLE	4,777
BOTANY WOODS	1,629
BROOKGLENN	3,756
CHEROKEE	2,459
DEL NORTE	4,000
DEVENGER	4,144
DOVE TREE	2,912
EDWARDS FOREST	2,467
FURMAN	5,028
LAKE FOREST	2,214
LEAWOOD	3,177
MEADOWOOD	1,353
MERRIFIELD	1,415

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 6

Area	Population
MONAGHAN	
Tract 0022.01	
Blocks: 113, 114, 115, 116A, 116B, 201, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 301, 302, 303, 304A, 304B, 304C, 305	597
Tract 0023.03	
Blocks: 831	0
MONAVIEW	5,008
NORTHWOOD	2,520
PARIS MOUNTAIN	1,368
PARK PLACE	3,550
PEBBLE CREEK	3,936
PIEDMONT PARK	4,124
PLEASANT GROVE	
Tract 0026.05	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 513, 514, 515	1,866
POINSETT	2,850
ROCK HILL	3,779
SULPHUR SPRINGS	
Tract 0037.01	
Blocks: 125B, 126, 127, 128	224
Tract 0037.02	
Blocks: 113, 114, 115, 122	103
TIMBERLAKE	1,782
UNION BLEACHERY	1,052
WELLINGTON	1,356
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,758
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.053

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ALEXANDER

Tract 0007.00

Blocks: 218B 13

Tract 0008.00

Blocks: 104C, 105B 9

Tract 0022.02

Blocks: 402C, 409C, 510A, 510B, 514, 516, 517 201

BELLE MEADE 3,226

BRANDON 2,691

CAROLINA 2,410

CITY VIEW

Tract 0009.00

Blocks: 309A, 310A, 311 43

Tract 0023.03

Blocks: 802A, 812A, 821, 822, 836 124

CONESTEE 3,042

DONALDSON 1,002

DUNEAN 2,996

FORK SHOAL

Tract 0032.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 131, 132 972

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431 561

GANTT 3,650

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area	Population
GREENBRIAR	
Tract 0029.01	
Blocks: 919	0
Tract 0029.02	
Blocks: 403A, 408A, 417A, 417B, 903, 904A, 904B, 905, 907, 908B, 921, 922	363
GREENVILLE 10	923
GREENVILLE 11	1,208
GREENVILLE 12	1,327
GREENVILLE 13	2,833
GREENVILLE 14	3,916
GREENVILLE 19	2,753
GREENVILLE 2	1,188
GREENVILLE 26	
Tract 0012.02	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 209, 210, 211, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 402, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 707, 708, 709, 710, 801, 802, 803, 804	2,401
GREENVILLE 4	2,480
GREENVILLE 5	1,816
GREENVILLE 6	1,757
GREENVILLE 7	2,024
GREENVILLE 8	2,704
GREENVILLE 9	1,807
GROVE	3,288
LAUREL CREEK	823
MAULDIN 3	2,106
MONAGHAN	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 104B, 302, 304B	61

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area	Population
Tract 0023.03	
Blocks: 801, 802B, 812B, 813, 814, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 837	252
PARAMOUNT	1,567
REEAY FORK	3,769
ROYAL OAKS	2,510
SOUTHSIDE	2,924
WASHINGTON HEIGHTS	2,459
WELCOME	
Tract 0021.04	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 601, 602, 605, 606, 609, 610, 618, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 819	1,047
Tract 0021.06	
Blocks: 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 721, 726, 728, 729	3,808
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,054
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.982

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 8

Area	Population
Greenville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BRYSON	2,516
FOUNTAIN INN	3,623
GILDER CREEK	6,295
GREENBRIAR	
Tract 0029.02	
Blocks: 402, 403B, 404A, 404B, 408B, 408C, 410, 411A, 411B, 412, 413, 414, 416C, 906B	483
Tract 0029.03	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 101C, 117, 118, 119, 127B, 128, 130, 131, 301C, 302B, 309B, 317B, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605A, 605C, 605D, 606A, 606C, 607, 608, 609	782
GREENVILLE 1	1,168
GREENVILLE 15	2,049
GREENVILLE 16	1,931
GREENVILLE 17	1,590
GREENVILLE 18	1,480
GREENVILLE 20	1,700
GREENVILLE 21	1,480
GREENVILLE 22	1,893
GREENVILLE 23	2,942
GREENVILLE 24	1,121
GREENVILLE 25	2,797
GREENVILLE 26	
Tract 0012.02	
Blocks: 205, 206, 207, 208	242
GREENVILLE 27	4,571
GREENVILLE 28	1,794
GREENVILLE 3	1,623
HILLCREST	2,836

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 8

Area	Population
MAULDIN 1	1,506
MAULDIN 2	3,095
MAULDIN 4	3,652
MISSION	1,781
PLINEY	2,842
ROCKY CREEK	4,360
SIMPSONVILLE 1	2,368
SIMPSONVILLE 2	4,251
SIMPSONVILLE 3	2,327
STANDING SPRINGS	
Tract 0030.07	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109A, 109B, 110, 111A, 111B, 112A, 112B, 113, 133, 134	622
WADE HAMPTON	1,598
WOODLAWN	2,554
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,872
PERCENT VARIATION	0.098

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area	Population
Greenville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DUNKLIN	2,862

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area	**Population**
FORK SHOALS	
Tract 0032.00	
Blocks: 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 511	969
HOPEWELL	3,304
PIEDMONT	3,032
STANDING SPRINGS	
Tract 0030.06	
Blocks: 207A, 207B, 314, 315A, 315B, 401A, 401B, 401C, 401D, 401E, 401F, 402, 403, 404, 405A, 405B, 406	2,156
Tract 0030.07	
Blocks: 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 202, 203, 204, 205, 208	1,246
WARE PLACE	3,535
Laurens County	58,092
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,196
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.794

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 10

Area	Population
Abbeville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ABBEVILLE 1	2,866
ABBEVILLE 2	2,762
ABBEVILLE 3	1,487
ABBEVILLE 4	1,403
ABBEVILLE MILL	776
ANTREVILLE	1,362
CALHOUN FALLS 1	1,932
CALHOUN FALLS 2	1,151
COLD SPRINGS	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 354	0
Tract 9504.00	
Blocks: 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155. 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170	877
LEBANON	658
LOWNDESVILLE 1	484
LOWNDESVILLE 2	336
MOUNTAIN VIEW	457
WATTS	345
Greenwood County	59,567
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,463
PERCENT VARIATION	0.877

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 11

Area	Population
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARROWOOD	517
BOILING SPRINGS	9,045
BOWEN	2,045
BROOKLYN COOLEY SPRINGS FIN	3,633
CAMPTON	9,718
CHESNEE	3,647
CUNNINGHAM	2,461
HAYNE SHOP	3,098
HILLTOP	829
INMAN	5,728
JOHNSON CITY	1,469
NEW PROSPECT	3,096
POWELL SAXON	3,345
UNA	1,389
WARD 1 BOX 1	1,907
WARD 1 BOX 2	998
WARD 1 BOX 3	3,142
WARD 2	3,079
WARD 3 BOX 3 STATION A	2,739
WARD 4 BOX 3	2,878
WARD 5	3,983
WARD 6	2,363
WELLFORD	2,455
WHITNEY STATION B	1,712
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,276
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.689

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 12

Area	Population
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARCADIA	569
ARKWRIGHT	1,343
ARLINGTON	2,687
BALLENGER	2,398
BEN AVON	3,932
BOBO	1,329
CAMPOBELLO	2,725
CANAAN	1,831
CEDAR SPRINGS	2,709
DUNCAN	5,062
EAST GREER	1,511
FAIRFOREST	3,354
GRAMLING	1,533
HOLLY SPRINGS	2,382
JACKSON MILL	762
LANDRUM	4,161
LYMAN	3,680
MOORE SWITZER	882
PELHAM	723
ROEBUCK	5,004
STARTEX	1,110
VICTOR MILL	3,988
WARD 1 BOX 4	1,862
WARD 1 BOX 5	2,921
WARD 3 BOX 2 STATION A	2,514
WARD 3 BOX 2 STATION B	728
WARD 3 BOX 3 STATION B	1,019
WARD 3 BOX 4 STATION A	2,960
WARD 3 BOX 4 STATION B	3,400
WEST VIEW	5,725

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 12

Area	Population
WOODS CHAPEL	1,030
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,834
PERCENT VARIATION	0.047

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 13

Area	Population
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BISHOP	2,437
CANNONS CAMPGROUND	1,389
CAVINS HOBBYSVILLE	872
CHEROKEE SPRINGS	3,556
CLIFTON	1,247
CONVERSE	1,863
COWPENS	4,827
CRESCENT	1,488
CROFT	2,424
CROSS ANCHOR	969
DEYOUNG	1,430
DRAYTON	1,131
ENOREE	1,890
FAIRMONT	3,144
GLENDALE	2,028
MAYO	2,826
MOTLOW	1,514
PACOLET MILLS	1,449
PACOLET	2,664
PAULINE GLENN SPRINGS	1,161

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 13

Area	Population
POPLAR SPRINGS	2,679
REIDVILLE	3,320
WALNUT GROVE	3,705
WARD 3 BOX 1	5,951
WARD 4 BOX 2	1,410
WHITE STONE	1,202
WHITNEY STATION A1	4,189
WHITNEY STATION A2	2,312
WOODRUFF 1	3,423
WOODRUFF 2	2,235
WOODRUFF 3	1,182
ZION HILL	3,773
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,690
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.142

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 14

Area	Population
Cherokee County	44,506
Union County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADAMSBURG	791
BONHAM	1,163
JONESVILLE 1	1,354
JONESVILLE 2	2,009
KELTON	1,369
LOCKHART 1	640
LOCKHART 2	541

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 14

Area	Population
MONARCH 1	1,926
OAKLAND	240
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETHANY	2,092
BETHEL NO 1	5,048
BETHEL NO 2	967
BOWLING GREEN	2,923
CLOVER NO 1	2,928
CLOVER NO 2	3,564
COTTON BELT	1,797
HICKORY GROVE	880
HOPEWELL	248
SMYRNA	955
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,941
PERCENT VARIATION	0.189

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area	Population
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CANNON MILL	3,899
CATAWBA	3,297
DELPHIA	1,980
EBENEZER	2,615
EBINPORT	2,526
FEWELL PARK	1,470
FILBERT	1,599

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area	Population
HIGHLAND PARK	2,086
INDIA HOOK	1,270
LESLIE NO 1	3,436
LESSLIE [SIC] NO 2	4,051
MT GALLANT	6,819
MT HOLLY	
Tract 0013.02	
Blocks: 201	0
Tract 0612.01	
Blocks: 239, 251	0
Tract 0613.01	
Blocks: 126A, 126B, 127, 201A, 201B, 202, 203, 204, 205, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230	1,002
Tract 0613.02	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233	767
MUSEUM	4,478
NEWPORT	3,294
NORTHSIDE	1,569
NORTHWESTERN	1,255
OAK RIDGE	2,533
ROCK HILL NO 1	1,040
ROCK HILL NO 4	5,902
ROCK HILL NO 5	2,475
ROCK HILL NO 6	
Tract 0601.01	
Blocks: 419, 420, 423	18

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area	Population
Tract 0603.00	
Blocks: 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 227, 228, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 312, 313, 314, 315, 317	2,514
ROCK HILL NO 7	3,553
TEGA CAY	
Tract 0610.02	
Blocks: 133, 134, 135, 202A, 203A, 204, 205A, 205B, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259	3,225
TIRZAH	1,604
UNIVERSITY	2,093
YORK NO 2	
Tract 0615.02	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 316, 317, 318, 319	445
Tract 0616.02	
Blocks: 217, 218, 219, 220, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 301A, 301B, 302, 303, 304A, 304B, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 501,	

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area	Population
502A, 502B, 503A, 503B, 503C, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521	2,581
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,396
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.530

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 16

Area	Population
Fairfield County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DUTCHMANS CREEK	679
GLADDEN GROVE	84
LEBANON	1,048
MITFORD	1,380
WINNSBORO 2	
Tract 9602.00	
Blocks: 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 367, 368, 369, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386	470
Tract 9603.00	
Blocks: 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 189, 191, 192, 193	44

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 16

Area	Population
Tract 9604.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103A, 103B, 104, 105, 106A, 106B, 107A, 107B, 108A, 108B, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118A, 118B, 119, 120, 121, 122A, 122B, 123A, 123B, 123C, 124, 125, 126, 127A, 127B, 127C, 128, 129A, 129B, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142A, 142B, 143, 144, 145, 146	1,081
WINNSBORO MILLS	1,620
Lancaster County	54,516
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
FORT MILL NO 1	3,289
FORT MILL NO 2	823
FORT MILL NO 3	3,210
FORT MILL NO 4	2,505
FORT MILL NO 5	2,351
FORT MILL NO 6	1,515
TEGA CAY	
Tract 0610.02	
Blocks: 201, 202B, 203B	425
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,040
PERCENT VARIATION	-1.000

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 17

Area	Population
Chester County	32,170
Fairfield County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLACKSTOCK	97
BLAIRS	689
CENTERVILLE	268
FEASTERVILLE	612
GREENBRIER	2,015
HICKORY RIDGE	1,423
HOREB	604
JENKINSVILLE	653
MONTICELLO	839
NEW HOPE	151
RIDGEWAY	2,653
SIMPSON	909
SOUTH WINNSBORO	1,155
WHITE OAK	605
WINNSBORO 1	2,864
WINNSBORO 2	
Tract 9602.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374	223
WOODWARD	129
Union County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLACK ROCK	
Tract 0307.00	
Blocks: 358, 359, 360, 362, 363, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383	396
CARLISLE	890
MEADOWS	941

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 17

Area	Population
SANTUCK	1,081
WARD 2	1,946
WARD 3	1,590
WARD 4 BOX 2	1,022
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLAIRSVILLE	699
BULLOCKS CREEK	399
EDGEWOOD	2,457
MCCONNELS	1,654
MT HOLLY	
Tract 0613.01	
Blocks: 115	254
OGDEN	1,950
ROCK HILL NO 2	3,485
ROCK HILL NO 3	3,600
ROCK HILL NO 6	
Tract 0013.01	
Blocks: 101	0
Tract 0603.00	
Blocks: 212, 213, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 308, 309, 310, 311, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324	1,568
Tract 0612.01	
Blocks: 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 238	173
Tract 0613.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106A, 106B, 107, 108, 109, 110A, 110B, 111, 112A, 112C, 113, 114B	271
SHAROH	883
YORK NO 1	2,626

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 17

Area **Population**

YORK NO 2

Tract 0616.02

Blocks: 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432 562

DISTRICT TOTAL 76,506

PERCENT VARIATION 0.934

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area **Population**

Lexington County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BATESBURG 3,697

CHAPIN 6,566

LEESVILLE

Tract 0214.00

Blocks: 147A, 169A, 170A, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 213B, 214A, 215A, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 501, 502, 503, 504B, 511B, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516C, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524A, 525, 526A, 527A, 528A, 608, 609A, 610A, 611, 612, 623, 624A, 624B, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651A, 651B, 652A, 653A, 654A, 654B, 655, 656A, 656B, 657, 658, 674A, 674B, 702, 703, 704, 725 2,213

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area **Population**

MIMS

Tract 0214.00

Blocks: 421B, 440B, 441B, 444B, 516D, 524B, 526B, 527B, 528B, 529, 530, 531, 532B, 533B, 533C, 534, 535B, 536B, 652B, 653B, 672, 673, 674C, 675, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711B, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 737 420

Tract 0215.97

Blocks: 495C 0

RIDGE ROAD

Tract 0214.00

Blocks: 138, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147B, 169B, 170B, 188, 189, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213C, 214B, 215B, 234B, 301, 302, 303B, 504C, 505B, 508B, 511C, 609B, 610B 312

Tract 0215.97

Blocks: 407B, 427B, 429, 430B, 431B, 431C, 432B, 434, 435B, 436D, 439B, 440B 3

Newberry County 33,172

Saluda County 16,357

Union County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BLACK ROCK

Tract 0307.00

Blocks: 319, 320, 321, 322, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 343, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 361, 365, 375, 376, 377, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393 230

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area	Population
BUFFALO 1	1,625
BUFFALO 2	464
CROSS KEYS	1,224
EXCELSIOR MILL	2,202
MONARCH 2	408
OTTARAY	385
PUTMAN	832
WARD 1 BOX 1	1,197
WARD 1 BOX 2	2,061
WARD 4 BOX 1	1,386
WEST SPRINGS	424
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,178
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.818

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT

DISTRICT 19

Area	Population
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARCADIA	
Tract 0111.02	
Blocks: 101, 103, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 119	427
ARDINCAPLE	832
BLYTHEWOOD	5,002
COLLEGE PLACE	3,822
DENNYSIDE	1,390
DENTSVILLE	4,141
EDGEWOOD	4,011

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 19

Area	Population
FAIDLAWN	2,539
FAIRWOPID	1,654
GREENVIEW	2,955
KEELS	4,481
KEENAN	
Tract 0108.04	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 518, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 528, 530, 531, 532	1,695
KILLIAN	1,490
LINCOLNSHIRE	3,944
MEADOWLAKE	5,050
MIDWAY	
Tract 0113.04	
Blocks: 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119	195
MONTICELLO	3,526
RIDGEWOOD	1,933
SPRING VALLEY	
Tract 0114.04	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 142, 143	659
WALDEN	
Tract 0103.03	
Blocks: 172A, 172B, 173	4
Tract 0103.04	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410A, 410B, 411A, 411B, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417A, 417B, 417C, 418, 419A, 419B, 420A, 420B, 421, 422, 423A, 423B, 424, 425, 426A, 426B,	

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 19

Area	Population
427A, 427B, 428A, 428B, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513	2,468
Tract 0104.06	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105A, 105B, 105C, 105D, 105E, 106, 107A, 107B, 107C, 108, 109, 137, 160, 201, 202, 203, 209, 210, 211, 212	6,380
WARD 19	2,721
WARD 20	2,451
WARD 21	3,172
WARD 22	2,368
WARD 29	1,604
WARD 31	1,956
WARD 3	
Tract 0006.00	
Blocks: 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 201A, 201B, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 401, 402, 403A, 403B, 403C, 404, 405, 406, 407A, 407B, 407C, 408A, 408B, 409A, 409B, 410, 411	1,854
Tract 0105.02	
Blocks: 110A, 110B, 111A, 111B, 120A, 120B	202
WARD 7	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 301B, 301F, 302, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326	578

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 19

Area **Population**

Tract 0109.00

Blocks: 206, 212A, 212B, 212C, 212D, 214A, 214B, 214D, 216 537

DISTRICT TOTAL 76,041

PERCENT VARIATION 0.321

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area **Population**

Richland County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BALLENTINE 3,358

BRANDON 2,405

FORT JACKSON 1,179

HAMPTON

Tract 0026.00

Blocks: 201A, 201B, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218A, 218B, 219A, 219B, 220A, 220B, 221, 222, 223, 224A, 224B, 225A, 225B, 226, 227A, 227B, 227C, 228A, 228B, 229, 230A, 230B, 231, 232, 233, 301A, 301B, 301C, 302A, 302B, 302C, 303A, 303B, 304A, 304B, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 315, 327, 805, 807, 910 2,107

HARBISON 4,609

KINGSWOOD 3,234

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area **Population**

MILL CREEK
Tract 0116.05
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611 1,871
Tract 0116.06
Blocks: 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416 250
NEW FRIARSGATE 5,227
OLD FRIARSGATE 2,137
PENNINGTON 1,747
RIVERSIDE 5,657
SPRINGVILLE 3,226
ST ANDREWS 2,215
WALDEN
Tract 0103.04
Blocks: 304, 305B, 308 25
WARD 10 2,211
WARD 11
Tract 0026.00
Blocks: 314A, 314B, 319A, 319B 39
WARD 12 2,172
WARD 13 2,942
WARD 14 2,183
WARD 15 1,188
WARD 17
Tract 0025.00
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 508, 512, 513 516
WARD 18 2,835
WARD 23 1,518

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area **Population**

WARD 27

Tract 0116.04

Blocks: 312, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 405, 406, 409, 412, 418A, 418B, 418C, 418D, 420, 421, 423A, 423B 1,728

Tract 0116.05

Blocks: 402, 407A, 407B, 407C, 407D 322

WARD 30 2,298

WARD 34 1,792

WARD 3

Tract 0016.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 114 ... 381

WARD 4

Tract 0005.00

Blocks: 202, 230, 231, 233, 239A, 239B, 243, 245A, 245B 4

Tract 0007.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 301, 302, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322 1,802

Tract 0009.00

Blocks: 301C 0

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area	**Population**
WARD 7	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 111, 112, 113, 114, 204A, 204B, 204C, 204D, 204E, 204F, 204G, 204H, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 301A, 301D, 301E, 303, 304, 319, 325	2,080
WHITEWELL	7,121
WOODLANDS	3,992
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,371
PERCENT VARIATION	0.756

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area	**Population**
Calhoun County	12,753
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLUFF	3,910
COOPER	3,522
EASTOVER	3,897
FJ 10	0
FJ 17	2,109
FJ 18	0
FJ 19	0
FJ 1	0
FJ 20	0
FJ 21	3,017

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area	Population
FJ 2	0
FJ 3	444
FJ 4	475
FJ 5	72
FJ 6	7
FJ 7	0
FJ 8	3,073
FJ 9	0
GADSDEN	2,563
GARNERS	1,131
HAMPTON	
Tract 0026.00	
Blocks: 806, 808A, 808B, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905A, 905B, 906A, 906B, 906C, 907, 908, 909, 914A, 914B, 915	790
HOPKINS	4,266
HORRELL HILL	4,303
HUNTING CREEK	493
MILL CREEK	
Tract 0116.05	
Blocks: 709, 710B, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722	3
OLYMPIA	2,320
PINEWOOD	
Tract 0119.01	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 306, 308	759
WARD 1	7,428

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area	Population
WARD 11	
Tract 0026.00	
Blocks: 513, 514, 515, 516, 607A, 607B, 607C, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 911A, 911B, 912, 913	3,152
WARD 2	885
WARD 27	
Tract 0116.05	
Blocks: 411, 415A, 415B, 701A, 701B, 701C, 701D, 701E, 701F, 701G, 701H, 702A, 702B, 703, 704A, 704B, 704C, 704D, 704E, 705, 706, 707, 708, 710A, 723, 724	1,997
Tract 0117.02	
Blocks: 204A, 204B, 206A, 206B, 207A, 207B	1
WARD 32	2,808
WARD 33	1,858
WARD 4	
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105	701
Tract 0010.00	
Blocks: 101, 102	581
WARD 5	2,421
WARD 8	2,061

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area	**Population**
WARD 9	2,716
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,516
PERCENT VARIATION	0.947

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 22

Area	**Population**
Kershaw County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DOBYS MILL	
Tract 9709.00	
Blocks: 514, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 551, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 583, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594	1,163
ELGIN 1	2,803
ELGIN 2	2,701
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARCADIA	
Tract 0111.02	
Blocks: 102A, 102B, 112, 114, 115A, 115B, 116, 117, 118, 120, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 201E, 201F, 201G, 201H, 202, 203A, 203B, 203C, 204A, 204B, 204C, 204D, 205A, 205B	761

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 22

Area	Population
Tract 0113.01	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 101C, 101D, 101E, 101F, 102, 103, 104, 105A, 105B, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 115, 116, 117, 118, 123, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307	2,563
BRIARWOOD	2,577
EFOREST ACRES	2,113
ESTATES	2,715
FJ 11	942
FJ 12	597
FJ 13	546
FJ 14	5
FJ 15	5
FJ 16	0
KEENAN	
Tract 0111.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 105C, 106, 107A, 107B, 107C, 107D, 107E, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 302, 304B, 304C, 304D, 310, 313, 314A, 314B, 314C, 314D, 316A, 316B, 316C, 316D, 316E, 316F, 316G	1,256
LYKESLAND	4,511

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 22

Area	Population
MIDWAY	
Tract 0113.04	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409	4,071
N FOREST ACRES	2,020
NORTH SPRINGS	5,194
OAKWOOD	1,815
PINE LAKES	4,432
PINEWOOD	
Tract 0116.06	
Blocks: 103, 125, 126, 127, 159, 160, 162	191
Tract 0119.01	
Blocks: 304, 305, 307, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318	947
PONTIAC	4,298
S FOREST ACRES	2,283
SATCHELFORD	1,176
SPRING VALLEY	
Tract 0114.03	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311	3,405
Tract 0114.04	
Blocks: 121, 122, 123, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313	2,853
WARD 16	1,432

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 22

Area	Population
WARD 17	
Tract 0023.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211	756
Tract 0024.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 215, 216, 217, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305	827
WARD 24	1,181
WARD 25	2,160
WARD 6	1,973
WILDEWOOD	4,367
WOODFIELD	5,573
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,212
PERCENT VARIATION	0.546

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 23

Area	Population
Lexington County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CHALLEDON	2,896
COLDSTREAM	3,511
CONGAREE	4,248
CROMER	6,290

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 23

Area	Population
EDMUND	
Tract 0209.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 203, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 326, 331	2,194
EMMANUEL CHURCH	4,031
GARDENDALE	1,199
IRMO	4,312
JAMIL ROAD	4,603
LAKESIDE	2,421
LEXINGTON 1	5,740
LEXINGTON 2	3,513
MURRAYWOOD	3,049
OLD BARNWELL STORE	3,190
PINEVIEW	
Tract 0206.02	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116B, 117B, 120, 121B	1,024

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 23

Area	Population
QUAIL VALLEY	1,941
RED BANK SOUTH	2,777
RED BANK	5,117
SEVEN OAKS	2,096
SPRINGDALE	2,743
ST MICHAEL	2,841
WHITEHALL	3,067
WOODLAND HILLS	2,462
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,265
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.703

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 24

Area	Population
Aiken County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AIKEN 1	1,428
AIKEN 3	
Tract 0216.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 211A, 212A	1,452
AIKEN 47	1,821
AIKEN 6	1,744
BEECH ISLAND	2,166
CAROLINA HEIGHTS	2,242
COLLEGE ACRES	1,566
COUCHTON	1,947
EUREKA	1,281
FOX CREEK	2,253

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 24

Area	Population
HAMMOND	2,546
HOLLOW CREEK	5,298
JACKSON	2,843
MILLBROOK	3,567
MONETTA	1,319
MONTMORENCI	1,381
NEW ELLENTON	2,515
NORTH AUGUSTA 25	1,949
NORTH AUGUSTA 26	3,548
NORTH AUGUSTA 27	1,911
NORTH AUGUSTA 28	2,142
NORTH AUGUSTA 29	1,547
NORTH AUGUSTA 54	1,851
NORTH AUGUSTA 55	1,465
REDDS BRANCH	1,384
SAVANNAH RIVER SITE	0
SHAWS FORK	668
SHILOH	1,961
TALATHA	4,351
TOWN CREEK	1,103
WARD	1,562

Lexington County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CRAPPS STORE	589
HOLLOW CREEK	2,103
LAKE MURRAY	1,935
LEESVILLE	
Tract 0213.00	
Blocks: 687, 688, 760, 761, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797	461

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 24

Area **Population**

Tract 0214.00

Blocks: 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 701, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733 548

MIMS

Tract 0214.00

Blocks: 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 712, 713, 714, 715, 734, 735, 736, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 821, 822, 823 999

MOUNT HOREB 2,649

RIDGE ROAD

Tract 0213.00

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311,

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 24

Area	Population
312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 420, 421, 438, 439, 440, 441, 443	1,097
Tract 0214.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123A, 123B, 124A, 124B, 124C, 125A, 125B, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168	748
Tract 0215.97	
Blocks: 370C, 370D, 371B, 372B, 373B, 374, 382B, 401B, 402B, 403B, 404B, 405, 406B	12
Tract 0215.98	
Blocks: 301, 349B, 349C, 368B, 368C, 369B, 369C, 390B, 391C, 391D, 391E, 391F, 391G, 392, 393B, 393C, 396, 397A, 397B	17
SUMMIT	1,307
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,276
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.689

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 25

Area	Population
Aiken County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AIKEN 2	2,617
AIKEN 3	
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 907A, 909A	173
Tract 0214.00	
Blocks: 101, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 520	609
Tract 0216.01	
Blocks: 104	0
AIKEN 4	2,336
AIKEN 5	2,656
BATH	1,749
BELVEDERE 44	2,260
BELVEDERE 45	4,684
BELVEDERE 9	2,277
BREEZY HILL	2,035
CHINA SPRINGS	2,258
CLEARWATER	1,511
GLOVERVILLE	1,577
GRANITEVILLE	2,759
JORDANTOWN	1,130
LANGLEY	2,843
LEVELS	3,042
LYNWOOD	1,608
SIX POINTS 35	1,431
SIX POINTS 46	2,370
VAUCLUSE	904
WARRENSVILLE	2,202
WILLOW SPRINGS	3,641

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 25

Area	**Population**
Edgefield County	18,375
McCormick County	8,868
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,915
PERCENT VARIATION	0.154

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area	**Population**
Aiken County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
NEW HOLLAND	844
OAK GROVE	864
PERRY	1,287
SALLEY	990
TABERNACLE	795
WAGENER	2,209
WHITE POND	783
WINDSOR	1,685
Lexington County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BOILING SPRINGS	2,526
CAYCE 1	1,877
CAYCE 2A	2,878
CAYCE 2	3,956
CAYCE 3	1,351
CHALK HILL	6,544
EDENWOOD	2,368

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area	Population
EDMUND	
Tract 0209.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 325, 327, 328, 329, 330, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 357, 363	1,575
FAIRVIEW	555
GASTON	4,292
GILBERT	1,671
HOOKS STORE	3,684
LEAPHART ROAD	2,426
MACK EDISTO	492
PELION	2,772
PINERIDGE	2,188
PINEVIEW	
Tract 0205.07	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527	2,502

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area	Population
POND BRANCH	2,443
QUAIL HOLLOW	2,325
ROUND HILL	1,411
SALUDA RIVER	3,144
SANOY RUN	770
SHARPES HILL	1,073
SWANSEA	3,272
WEST COLUMBIA #1	1,269
WEST COLUMBIA #2	1,824
WEST COLUMBIA #3	692
WEST COLUMBIA #4	2,831
WESTOVER	1,959
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,127
PERCENT VARIATION	0.434

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 27

Area	Population
Chesterfield County	38,577
Kershaw County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AIRPORT	2,308
ANTIOCH	820
BETHUNE	1,877
BUFFALO	1,277
CAMDEN 1	1,356
CAMDEN 2	574
CAMDEN 3	1,008
CAMDEN 4	1,600

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 27

Area	Population
CAMDEN 5A	886
CAMDEN 5	562
CAMDEN 6	601
CASSATT	1,316
CHARLOTTE THOMPSON	1,955
DOBYS MILL	
Tract 9709.00	
Blocks: 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 513, 515, 516, 517, 539, 540, 541, 547, 548, 549, 550, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 595, 596, 597	132
EAST CAMDEN-HERMITAGE	929
GATES FORD	441
LIBERTY HILL	385
LUGOFF 1	1,416
LUGOFF 2	2,427
LUGOFF 3	1,292
MALVERN HILL	1,908
RABONS CROSSROADS	1,671
RIVERDALE	1,629
SALT POND	1,210
SHAYLORS HILL	925
SPRINGDALE	2,269
WESTVILLE	2,123
WHITE GARDENS	2,035
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,509
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.381

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area	**Population**
Dillon County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BERMUDA	437
CAROLINA	521
EAST DILLON	2,939
FLOYDALE	913
FORK	788
GADDY'S MILL	523
HAMER	1,201
KEMPER	643
LAKE VIEW	2,122
MANNING	671
MT. CALVARY	
Tract 9702.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 423, 424, 431, 432, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440	1,565
OAKLAND	965
PLEASANT HILL	380
Horry County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADRIAN	1,698
ALLSBROOK	840
ATLANTIC BEACH	446
AYNOR	1,685
BAYBORO	1,274
BROOKSVILLE	1,613
CEDAR GROVE	773

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area	Population
CHERRY GROVE	2,637
COOL SPRINGS	622
CRESCENT BEACH	1,778
DAISY	1,026
DOG BLUFF	925
DOGWOOD	340
DUNES 2	988
DUNES 3	1,234
EAST LORIS	2,386
EBENEZER	480
FLOYDS	820
FOUR MILE	1,516
GALIVANTS FERRY	258
GREEN SEA	1,659
GURLEY	274
HICKORY GROVE	1,215
HICKORY HILL	240
HOMEWOOD	970
HORRY	879
JERNIGANS CROSS ROADS	873
JORDANVILLE	525
JOYNER SWAMP	422
JUNIPER BAY	1,433
LEON	983
LITTLE RIVER	2,762
LIVE OAK	376
METHODIST RHEOBETH	577
MILL SWAMP	280
MOUNT OLIVE	582
MOUNT VERNON	600
NIXONS CROSSROADS	1,760
NORTON	243

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area	Population
OCEAN DRIVE 1	1,680
OCEAN DRIVE 2	1,935
PLEASANT VIEW	385
POPLAR HILL	1,022
RACEPATH 1	1,566
RACEPATH 2	2,441
RED BLUFF	743
SHELL	890
SPRING BRANCH	517
SWEET HOME	927
TAYLORSVILLE	487
WAMPEE	1,721
WEST LORIS	1,737
WHITE OAK	483
WINDY HILL	1,529
Marlboro County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CLIO	
Tract 9604.00	
Blocks: 401, 402, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465	135
Tract 9605.00	
Blocks: 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 275, 277	130
EAST MCCOLL	1,649
MCCOLL	2,291
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,928
PERCENT VARIATION	0.172

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area	Population
Darlington County	61,851
Marlboro County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADAMSVILLE	718
BRIGHTSVILLE	837
BROWNSVILLE	526
QUICKS CROSS ROADS	2,106
RED HILL	1,630
SOUTH BENNETTSVILLE	1,528
WALLACE	1,821
WEST BENNETTSVILLE	4,910
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,927
PERCENT VARIATION	0.170

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area	Population
Dillon County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
LATTA	3,627
LITTLE ROCK	752
MINTURN	472
MT. CALVARY	
Tract 9702.00	
Blocks: 222, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 433, 434	1,143
NEW HOLLY	666

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area	Population
OAK GROVE	1,057
SOUTH DILLON	3,748
WEST DILLON	3,981
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CLAUSSEN	1,337
FLORENCE WARD 10	1,578
FLORENCE WARD 1	2,415
FLORENCE WARD 2	2,606
FLORENCE WARD 3	3,001
FLORENCE WARD 9	3,315
GILBERT	2,534
KINGSBURG	651
MARS BLUFF 1	3,883
MILL BRANCH	819
PAMPLICO 2	1,255
SPAULDING	1,538
STONE	787
Marion County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
MARION 1	2,122
MARION 2	2,187
MARION NORTH	1,351
MARION SOUTH	4,690
MARION WEST	1,839
NICHOLS	1,341
NORTHEAST MULLINS	3,967
NORTHWEST MULLINS	3,254
SELLERS	590
TEMPERANCE	1,346
ZION	793

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area **Population**

Marlboro County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BLENHEIM..... 471

CLIO

Tract 9604.00

Blocks: 245, 246, 247, 248, 249..... 14

Tract 9605.00

Blocks: 112, 113, 114, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132A, 132B, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248A, 248B, 249, 250A, 250B, 251A, 251B, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256A, 256B, 257A, 257B, 258, 259A, 259B, 260A, 260B, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 276, 278, 279, 280, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306A, 306B, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318A, 318B, 319A, 319B, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326A, 326B, 327, 328, 329A, 329B, 330A, 330B, 331A, 331B, 332A, 332B, 333A, 333B, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 396, 397..... 2,546

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 25

Area **Population**

GREENVILLE 23

Tract 0019.00

Blocks: 903 7

Tract 0029.01

Blocks: 905, 906, 910A, 912A, 912B, 917A, 917B, 918A, 950A, 950B, 963A 1,210

GROVE

Tract 0035.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 115, 116, 117, 118, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 919, 920, 921 1,036

Tract 0036.02

Blocks: 905, 906, 907, 908 842

LAUREL CREEK..... 823

MAULDIN 1

Tract 0029.02

Blocks: 901A..... 206

PARAMOUNT

Tract 0014.00

Blocks: 401A, 402A, 409, 410A, 411, 412 ... 540

Tract 0015.02

Blocks: 612A, 612B, 701A, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 711A, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716A, 717A, 717B, 718, 719, 720A, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808.....1,027

PIEDMONT

Tract 0033.01

Blocks: 101 0

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 25

Area **Population**

REEAY FORK

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 116, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 245, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333 3,006

ROYAL OAKS 2,510

SOUTHSIDE

Tract 0021.03

Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 107, 108A, 108B, 126, 127, 128, 129, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229 1,850

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,286

PERCENT VARIATION 0.597

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ALEXANDER

Tract 0007.00

Blocks: 218B 13

Tract 0008.00

Blocks: 104C, 105B 9

Tract 0022.01

Blocks: 413B, 414B, 501A, 501B, 506, 508, 509B, 509C, 712A, 712B, 713, 714 297

Tract 0022.02

Blocks: 501A, 501B, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510A, 510B, 511, 512, 514, 516, 517, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 620, 622, 623, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712A, 712B 1,910

BRANDON

Tract 0021.04

Blocks: 401, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 607, 608, 619, 620, 621, 622, 820 412

Tract 0021.05

Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408,409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 423, 502, 503A, 503B, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 515, 516, 517, 525, 526 ... 1,092

CITY VIEW 1,440

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area	Population
GREENVILLE 7	
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104A, 105A, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112A, 112B, 112C, 113A, 113B, 114A, 114B, 115, 116A, 116B, 117, 118	506
Tract 0021.05	
Blocks: 501A, 501B	2
MONAGHAN	910
MONAVIEW	
Tract 0037.04	
Blocks: 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 318	956
TANGLEWOOD	3,849
WESTCLIFFE	3,173
WESTSIDE	3,716
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CROSSWELL	2,611
DACUSVILLE	
Tract 0105.01	
Blocks: 152	0
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 137, 138, 139, 145, 154, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329	2,382
GEORGES CREEK	1,276

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 26

Area	**Population**
MCKISSICK	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 135, 136, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 165, 166, 207, 208, 209, 214	534
POWDERSVILLE	3,211
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,299
PERCENT VARIATION	0.644

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 27

Area	**Population**
Greenville County	
Census Votinq Tabulation Districts	
BRYSON	2,516
FOUNTAIN INN	3,623
GILDER CREEK	
Tract 0028.06	
Blocks: 151, 152, 317, 318, 319	911
Tract 0028.07	
Blocks: 303, 304, 305, 306	448
Tract 0030.03	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134	2,681
HILLCREST	
Tract 0030.03	
Blocks: 119, 123, 126, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141	340

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 27

Area	Population
Tract 0030.04	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118A, 118B, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123A, 123B, 123C, 124, 128, 134B, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139B, 140C, 179B, 179C, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184	2,246
Tract 0030.05	
Blocks: 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208A, 208B, 209, 210, 211, 213B, 214B, 215A, 215B, 216A, 216B, 218B, 254B	113
HOPEWELL	3,304
SIMPSONVILLE 1	2,368
SIMPSONVILLE 2	4,251
SIMPSONVILLE 3	2,327
STANDING SPRINGS	
Tract 0030.06	
Blocks: 207A, 207B, 314, 315A, 315B, 401A, 401B, 401C, 401D, 401E, 401F, 402, 403, 404, 405A, 405B, 406	2,156
Tract 0030.07	
Blocks: 108, 109A, 109B, 110, 111A, 111B, 112A, 112B, 113, 114, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 202, 203, 204, 205	639
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,923
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.694

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CONESTEE

Tract 0029.01

Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 449, 450, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 931 1,028

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 109, 118, 119, 120 ... 421

DUNKLIN 2,862

FORK SHOALS

Tract 0032.00

Blocks: 101, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 511 1,051

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 401, 402, 430, 431 207

GANTT

Tract 0020.03

Blocks: 905, 906 461

Tract 0034.00

Blocks: 911, 912, 913, 914 89

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area **Population**

GILDER CREEK

Tract 0028.07

Blocks: 103, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 105C, 105D, 106A, 106B, 106C, 106D, 106E, 106F, 106G, 106J, 106K, 107A, 107B, 107C, 107D, 108A, 108B, 108C, 108D, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 301, 302A, 302B 1,979

GREENBRIAR 1,628

GROVE

Tract 0033.01

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 226, 227, 228 901

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304 169

Tract 0035.00

Blocks: 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 119, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 922 340

HILLCREST

Tract 0030.04

Blocks: 107, 108A, 108B, 108C, 108D, 108E, 109 119

Tract 0030.05

Blocks: 201, 202, 212 18

MAULDIN 1

Tract 0029.02

Blocks: 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 901B, 902 1,300

MAULDIN 3 2,106

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area **Population**

MAULDIN 4

Tract 0028.07

Blocks: 106H 8

Tract 0029.03

Blocks: 102, 103A, 103B, 103C, 103D, 103E, 113, 114, 115, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127A, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 301A, 301B, 302A, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309A, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317A, 605B, 606B 3,387

PIEDMONT

Tract 0033.01

Blocks: 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 208, 209, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 901, 902, 903 3,032

PLINEY

Tract 0028.06

Blocks: 139, 140 353

REEAY FORK

Tract 0033.02

Blocks: 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117 763

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 28

Area	**Population**
ROCKY CREEK	
Tract 0028.06	
Blocks: 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138	143
Tract 0028.07	
Blocks: 101, 102	784
STANDING SPRINGS	
Tract 0030.07	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 208	1,229
WARE PLACE	3,535
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,913
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.729

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area	**Population**
Cherokee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALLENS	
Tract 9705.00	
Blocks: 758, 759, 760, 762, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795	1,051
Tract 9706.00	
Blocks: 507	2
DRAYTONVILLE	2,444

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area **Population**

GAFFNEY WARD 4
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 115A, 117, 118, 119, 120A, 123A, 124, 126, 133A, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141 769
GAFFNEY WARD 6 2,079
LITTLEJOHNS
Tract 9707.00
Blocks: 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257 202
MACEDONIA
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 115B 0
METCALF 535
MUSGROVE MILL
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 423, 424, 501B, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 606B, 633B 689
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 115C, 115D, 120B, 121, 122, 123B, 133B 172
Tract 9706.00
Blocks: 223B, 301C, 302B, 303B, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309B, 314, 318, 322B, 323, 324, 329B, 336B, 337B, 338, 339, 340, 341, 401B, 402B, 402C, 403B, 404B, 405B, 406, 407, 408, 409B, 411C, 414B, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area **Population**

423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430,
431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438,
439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446,
447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452. 453, 454,
455, 456, 457, 458D, 459B, 460, 461, 462,
463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470,
471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478 . . . 1,531

SARRATTS 205

TIMBER RIDGE

Tract 9706.00

Blocks: 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 541, 542,
543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550,
551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558,
559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 573, 574,
616 921

WILKINSVILLE 389

Chester County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BALDWIN MILL

Tract 0205.00

Blocks: 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318,
323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330,
331, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411,
412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418 816

BATON ROUGE 1,014

CHESTER WARD 1

Tract 0203.00

Blocks: 201B, 504, 505, 506B, 507, 508,
509, 528, 529B 296

Tract 0204.00

Blocks: 138, 139, 140, 146, 147, 148, 149,
150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157 197

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area	Population
Tract 0205.00	
Blocks: 305, 306	28
CHESTER WARD 4	
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 545, 546, 547, 559, 560, 561	273
EDGEMOOR	
Tract 0207.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 106	35
Tract 0208.00	
Blocks: 114, 115	0
EUREKA MILL	
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 510, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527	338
Tract 0204.00	
Blocks: 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235	306
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 537, 538, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571	682
HALSELLVILLE	335
LOWRYS	1,126
RODMAN	
Tract 0204.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 215, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 236, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250	494
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 29

Area	Population
532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 572, 573, 574	513
Tract 0207.00	
Blocks: 104, 105, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143	112
WILKSBURG	976
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETHANY	2,092
BLAIRSVILLE	699
BULLOCKS CREEK	399
COTTON BELT	1,797
HICKORY GROVE	880
HOPEWELL	248
MCCONNELLS	
Tract 0614.01	
Blocks: 123, 128A, 128B, 129A, 129B, 131, 133, 134, 137, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148A, 148B, 202, 203, 204, 208, 209A, 209B, 214A, 215, 216A, 216B, 217, 218, 219, 220A, 220B, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226A, 226B, 227, 228, 229A, 229B, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 248, 251A, 251B, 263, 264	1,370
SHAROH	883
SMYRNA	955
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,853
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.942

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area **Population**

Cherokee County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ALMA MILL 2,703
ANTIOCH 693
ASHWORTH 873
BLACKSBURG WARD 1 941
BLACKSBURG WARD 2 452
BLACKSBURG WARD 3 797
BLACKSBURG WARD 4 1,193
BUFFALO 822
CENTRAL 1,151
CHEROKEE FALLS 890
GAFFNEY WARD 1 1,744
GAFFNEY WARD 2 2,230
GAFFNEY WARD 3 1,905
GAFFNEY WARD 4
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 413A, 417A, 602A, 602B, 602C, 603, 604,605, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763 ... 1,055
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 110A, 110B, 111A, 112A, 113A, 113B, 116A,125A, 125B, 138 106
Tract 9706.00
Blocks: 101, 102, 113, 114 31
GAFFNEY WARD 5 747
GRASSY POND 1,445

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area	Population
HOLLY GROVE	622
KINGS CREEK	610
LIMESTONE	1,975
MACEDONIA	
Tract 9701.00	
Blocks: 301	0
Tract 9702.00	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408,409, 410, 411, 412, 413C, 413D, 414, 415B, 416B, 417B, 417C, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422	313
Tract 9703.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103C, 104B, 106B, 107B, 110C,111B, 112B	192
MORGAN	1,207
MUSGROVE MILL	
Tract 9703.00	
Blocks: 112C, 113C, 114, 116B	1
NINETY NINE	462
PLEASANT GROVE	1,256
PLEASANT MEADOWS	1,141
WOODS	402
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,959
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.565

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 31

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ARKWRIGHT

Tract 0207.00

Blocks: 201A, 202, 301, 302A, 302B, 303A, 303B, 304, 305, 306A, 306B, 307A, 307B, 307C, 401C 193

Tract 0209.00

Blocks: 219A, 225A 0

Tract 0210.020

Blocks: 203 3

POWELL SAXON

Tract 0204.00

Blocks: 222A, 224A, 225A, 229A, 230A..... 52

Tract 0205.00

Blocks: 301A, 302A 5

Tract 0206.01

Blocks: 118, 120A, 120B, 121A, 122A..... 8

Tract 0217.00

Blocks: 305, 314, 319, 320, 322, 323, 324, 326, 402, 403, 410, 411, 412, 413, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514A, 514B, 514C, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524..... 3,138

ROEBUCK

Tract 0220.01

Blocks: 113A, 113B, 114A, 119, 120, 121.... 320

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 31

Area	Population
UNA	
Tract 0217.00	
Blocks: 401A	43
WARD 1 BOX 1	1,907
WARD 1 BOX 2	998
WARD 1 BOX 3	3,142
WARD 1 BOX 5	
Tract 0212.00	
Blocks: 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127	289
WARD 2	3,079
WARD 3 BOX 2 STATION A	
Tract 0211.00	
Blocks: 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 301, 302, 303A, 322, 324, 325, 328, 330, 331, 332, 509, 607A	1,343
WARD 3 BOX 2 STATION B	728
WARD 3 BOX 3 STATION A	2,739
WARD 3 BOX 4 STATION A	
Tract 0207.00	
Blocks: 333C	43
Tract 0220.01	
Blocks: 114B	0
WARD 4 BOX 2	
Tract 0203.02	
Blocks: 119, 123, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 137, 206, 207	19
Tract 0212.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 104, 107, 122	27
WARD 4 BOX 3	2,878
WARD 5	3,983
WARD 6	2,363

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 31

Area **Population**

WHITNEY STATION B

Tract 0203.01

Blocks: 201A, 202A, 202B, 203A, 321A 76

Tract 0216.00

Blocks: 302, 310, 312, 337, 339, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410 490

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,866

PERCENT VARIATION .....-0.896

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 32

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BEN AVON

Tract 0213.02

Blocks: 301B, 301C, 302, 303, 304, 305A, 305B, 305C, 305D, 401B 274

CANNONS CAMPGROUND 1,389

CHEROKEE SPRINGS

Tract 0224.03

Blocks: 119, 120, 121, 137, 146, 147, 148, 204,206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229.....1,372

CONVERSE 1,863

DRAYTON 1,131

MAYO.....2,826

WARD 1 BOX 4 1,862

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 32

Area **Population**

WARD 1 BOX 5

Tract 0212.00

Blocks: 115, 116, 117, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 324, 325, 326 2,409

Tract 0213.02

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207 ... 223

WARD 3 BOX 1

Tract 0213.01

Blocks: 101, 111, 113, 114, 116, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 132, 133, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 305A, 305D, 306A 1,777

Tract 0213.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126 798

Tract 0213.03

Blocks: 103C, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207A, 207B, 208A, 208B, 208C, 301, 302A, 302B, 302C, 302D, 303, 304, 305 .. 2,465

WARD 3 BOX 2 STATION A

Tract 0211.00

Blocks: 117, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 501A, 502A, 503, 504, 507, 508 1,171

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 32

Area **Population**

WARD 4 BOX 2
Tract 0203.02
Blocks: 101, 102A, 102B, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 139, 201A, 202, 203A, 204A, 205, 216, 217A, 218, 221A, 223A 862
Tract 0213.01
Blocks: 118, 119, 120 322
Tract 0215.00
Blocks: 222, 223, 224, 225, 226A, 226B, 226C, 226D, 226E, 227 180
WHITNEY STATION A1 4,189
WHITNEY STATION A2 2,312
ZION HILL
Tract 0213.01
Blocks: 306C, 307, 308 445

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,870

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.882

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 33

Area **Population**

Cherokee County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ALLENS

Tract 9706.00

Blocks: 508, 509, 510, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538 512

BROWNS MILL 395

BUTLER 448

EZELLS 941

GOUCHER 646

LITTLEJOHNS

Tract 9707.00

Blocks: 166, 167, 168, 169, 226, 229 48

MACEDONIA

Tract 9701.00

Blocks: 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 349, 401, 402, 403, 404A, 405, 408, 411, 420, 421, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 437, 438, 439, 440 769

RAVENA 325

THICKETTY 484

TIMBER RIDGE

Tract 9706.00

Blocks: 539, 540, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572 156

WHITE PLAINS 834

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 33

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BEN AVON

Tract 0221.00

Blocks: 101, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 135, 136, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 284, 285, 286, 290, 294, 301, 304, 309, 311, 316, 317 3,015

Tract 0239.00

Blocks: 106 2

CLIFTON 1,247

COWPENS 4,827

CROFT 2,424

GLENDALE 2,028

PACOLET MILLS 1,449

PACOLET 2,664

WARD 3 BOX 1

Tract 0213.03

Blocks: 103A, 118D, 118E, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407A, 407B, 408 911

WHITE STONE

Tract 0221.00

Blocks: 228, 318, 327, 328 71

Tract 0239.00

Blocks: 107, 109, 110, 113, 114, 117, 118 ... 327

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 33

Area	Population
ZION HILL	
Tract 0213.01	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305B, 305C, 305E	280
Tract 0213.03	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 102, 103B, 103D, 104A, 104B, 104C, 105A, 105B, 105C, 106, 107, 117A, 117B, 118A, 118B, 118C, 118F, 118G, 118H, 118J, 119A, 119B, 119C, 120A, 120B, 120C, 120D, 120E, 120F, 120G, 121A, 121B, 501A, 501B, 501C, 501D, 501E, 501F, 502A, 502B, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509A, 509B, 509C, 510A, 510B, 511, 512A, 512B, 512C, 513, 514	1,816
Tract 0221.00	
Blocks: 102, 103, 104A, 104B, 115	69
Tract 0222.01	
Blocks: 211, 311, 312, 314, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 332, 334, 335, 336, 414, 415, 417, 418A, 418B, 424	1,163
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,851
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.950

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ARCADIA 569

ARKWRIGHT

Tract 0207.00

Blocks: 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333B, 334, 336, 337, 401A 1,147

BEN AVON

Tract 0213.02

Blocks: 401C, 410, 413, 414, 415, 416, 418, 419 237

Tract 0221.00

Blocks: 302, 303, 305, 306, 310, 312, 313, 314, 315 404

BOBO 1,329

CEDAR SPRINGS 2,709

FAIRFOREST 3,354

ROEBUCK

Tract 0207.00

Blocks: 333A, 333D, 335B 0

Tract 0220.01

Blocks: 101B, 102B, 104, 105B, 106B, 107A, 107C, 108, 110, 111B, 112, 117, 128, 201B, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 521, 522A, 522B, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 532, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618 ... 4,553

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area **Population**

Tract 0220.03

Blocks: 604, 605, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615 31

WARD 3 BOX 3 STATION B 1,019

WARD 3 BOX 4 STATION A

Tract 0206.01

Blocks: 121B 22

Tract 0206.02

Blocks: 201 397

Tract 0206.03

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 303, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315 ... 1,336

Tract 0207.00

Blocks: 335A, 407, 408, 413, 415 762

Tract 0220.01

Blocks: 101A, 107B, 109, 111A 400

WARD 3 BOX 4 STATION B 3,400

WEST VIEW 5,725

WHITE STONE

Tract 0221.00

Blocks: 307, 308C, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 326 382

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,876

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.861

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area	**Population**
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BISHOP	2,437
CANAAN	1,831
CAVINS HOBBYSVILLE	872
CRESCENT	1,488
ENOREE	1,890
FAIRMONT	
Tract 0231.02	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 617	1,144
Tract 0234.00	
Blocks: 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 212, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339	1,930
MOTLOW	1,514
PAULINE GLENN SPRINGS	
Tract 0238.00	
Blocks: 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273	705
POPLAR SPRINGS	2,679

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area **Population**

REIDVILLE

Tract 0234.00

Blocks: 327, 418, 419, 420, 421, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540 2,278

WALNUT GROVE

Tract 0235.00

Blocks: 232, 233, 234, 235 48

Tract 0238.00

Blocks: 301, 302, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 586 ... 1,872

WHITE STONE

Tract 0238.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208 120

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area **Population**

Tract 0239.00

Blocks: 404, 405, 407, 408, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444 302

WOODRUFF 1 3,423

WOODRUFF 2 2,235

WOODRUFF 3 1,182

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,950

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.597

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 36

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ARLINGTON 2,687

BALLENGER 2,398

CUNNINGHAM 2,461

DEYOUNG 1,430

DUNCAN

Tract 0230.00

Blocks: 355, 356 15

Tract 0231.01

Blocks: 101A, 101B, 102, 103A, 103B, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 36

Area **Population**

124, 125A, 125B, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130A, 130B, 130C, 130D, 130E, 131, 132, 133, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 201E, 202, 203, 204A, 204B, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213A, 213B, 214A, 214B, 215, 216, 217, 218A, 218B, 219, 220, 221A, 221B, 222A, 222B, 223, 224, 225, 301A, 301B, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 347, 348, 350, 360, 401A, 401B, 401C, 401D, 401E, 402, 403, 404, 405, 412, 413 3,634

Tract 0232.00

Blocks: 204, 205, 210, 211, 212, 217, 228, 229, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 416 ... 1,043

FAIRMONT

Tract 0231.01

Blocks: 501, 502, 503 60

Tract 0234.00

Blocks: 324 10

HOLLY SPRINGS 2,382

INMAN

Tract 0228.00

Blocks: 519 13

Tract 0229.00

Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511A, 511B, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546 937

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 36

Area	Population
JACKSON MILL	762
LYMAN	3,680
PELHAM	723
REIDVILLE	
Tract 0231.01	
Blocks: 308	0
Tract 0232.00	
Blocks: 513, 514, 516, 523, 528, 529, 539, 540, 541, 542	218
Tract 0234.00	
Blocks: 325, 326, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 422, 423, 424, 425	824
STARTEX	1,110
VICTOR MILL	
Tract 0232.00	
Blocks: 425, 426, 427	69
WELLFORD	2,455
WOODS CHAPEL	1,030
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,941
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.629

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area	Population
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BOILING SPRINGS	
Tract 0214.00	
Blocks: 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809	792

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area	Population
Tract 0218.01	
Blocks: 101, 113, 303, 317A, 317B, 318	122
Tract 0218.02	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410	955
Tract 0224.02	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314	3,528
Tract 0224.03	
Blocks: 322, 323, 324	215
CAMPTON	9,718
HAYNE SHOP	3,098
HILLTOP	829
INMAN	
Tract 0228.00	
Blocks: 116, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 171, 172	230
Tract 0229.00	
Blocks: 101, 102A, 102B, 103A, 103B, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111A, 111B, 112, 113, 114, 115A, 115B, 116A, 116B, 117A, 117B, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124A, 124B, 125A, 125B, 125C, 126, 127, 128, 201, 202, 203, 204A, 204B, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211A, 211B, 212, 213, 214A, 214B, 214C, 214D, 215, 216, 217A, 217B, 218A, 218B, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234A, 234B, 235, 280,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area **Population**

281, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 289, 290, 291, 292A, 292B, 293, 294, 295, 296A, 296B, 297, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318A, 318B, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324A, 324B, 325, 326, 327, 328A, 328B, 329A, 329B, 329C, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 387, 390, 391, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 426, 504, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914 4,548

JOHNSON CITY 1,469

POWELL SAXON

Tract 0217.00

Blocks: 302, 303, 304, 315, 318 142

UNA

Tract 0217.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 202, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 301 1,346

WHITNEY STATION B

Tract 0216.00

Blocks: 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 301, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311A, 311B, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317A, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324A, 324B, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 338 1,146

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area **Population**

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,138

PERCENT VARIATION 0.071

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 38

Area **Population**

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ARROWOOD 517

BOILING SPRINGS

Tract 0224.02

Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 442, 443, 517, 518, 519, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550 2,854

Tract 0224.03

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 321 579

BOWEN 2,045

BROOKLYN COOLEY SPRINGS FIN 3,633

CAMPOBELLO 2,725

CHEROKEE SPRINGS

Tract 0224.03

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 38

Area	Population
127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 201, 202, 203, 205, 212, 213, 304, 305, 306, 320	2,184
CHESNEE	3,647
GRAMLING	1,533
LANDRUM	4,161
MOORE SWITZER	882
NEW PROSPECT	3,096
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,856
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.932

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 39

Area	Population
Lexington County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BATESBURG	3,697
LEESVILLE	3,222
MIMS	1,419
POND BRANCH	2,443
RIDGE ROAD	2,189
Saluda County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CLYDE	505
DELMAR	555
DENNY	398
FRUIT HILL	1,110
HIGGINS	230

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 39

Area	**Population**
HOLLYWOOD	1,062
HOLLY	829
HOLSTONS	995
MONETTA	253
MOUNT WILLING	294
PLEASANT CROSS	362
PLEASANT GROVE	552
RICHLAND	682
RIDGE SPRING	1,329
SALUDA 1	2,489
SALUDA 2	1,787
SARDIS	722
WARD	607
ZOAR	309
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,040
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.277

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area **Population**

Newberry County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BETH EDEN

Tract 9505.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112A, 112C, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 201A, 201B,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area	Population
201C, 202B, 203B, 204C, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210B, 211, 212B, 302, 307B, 308B	580
BUSH RIVER	600
CHAPPELLS	711
FAIRVIEW ONEAL	2,116
HARTFORD	1,192
HELENA	1,332
JOHNSTONE	801
KINARDS JACAPA	765
LITTLE MOUNTAIN	1,252
MIDWAY	283
MOUNT BETHEL GARMANY	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 135, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214B, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220B, 221D, 223C, 224B, 226C, 227B, 228, 229, 301, 302, 303B, 304, 305, 306B, 321, 322, 325, 326	1,340
NEWBERRY WARD 1	749
NEWBERRY WARD 2	1,984
NEWBERRY WARD 3 NO.1	455
NEWBERRY WARD 3 NO.2	1,138
NEWBERRY WARD 4	1,333
NEWBERRY WARD 5	1,320
NEWBERRY WARD 6	1,765
OAKLAND	1,738
PEAK	177
POMARIA	899
PROSPERITY	2,320
SAINT PHILLIP JOLLY STREET	1,104

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area	**Population**
SILVERSTREET	1,176
STONEY HILL	726
WHEELAND	375
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,231
PERCENT VARIATION	0.402

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 41

Area	**Population**
Chester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BALDWIN MILL	
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 108	0
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104A, 104C, 105, 106B, 109A	247
Tract 0205.00	
Blocks: 319, 320, 321, 322, 401. 402, 403, 404, 419, 420	325
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105	56
BLACKSTOCK	920
CHESTER WARD 1	
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 201A, 506A, 529A, 530	523
CHESTER WARD 2	
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 222B	0

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 41

Area	Population
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 104B, 106A, 107A, 107B, 107C, 107D, 108, 110	467
Tract 0205.00	
Blocks: 421, 422	5
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 106A, 106B, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 119, 120	135
CHESTER WARD 3	
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 306, 307, 316, 317, 318A, 318B, 319A, 319B, 324B, 404, 405, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429A, 429B, 430A, 430B, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435	948
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 107, 113A, 113B, 113C, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118A, 118B, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 141, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 202A, 202B, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 308B, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475	1,032
HAZELWOOD	692
ROSSVILLE	698
Fairfield County	22,295
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,343
PERCENT VARIATION	0.800

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 42

Area	Population
Union County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADAMSBURG	791
BONHAM	1,163
BUFFALO 1	1,625
BUFFALO 2	464
CARLISLE	890
EXCELSIOR MILL	2,202
JONESVILLE 1	1,354
JONESVILLE 2	2,009
KELTON	1,369
LOCKHART 1	640
LOCKHART 2	541
MEADOWS	941
MONARCH 1	1,926
MONARCH 2	408
OAKLAND	240
OTTARAY	385
PUTMAN	
Tract 0307.00	
Blocks: 108, 111, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205	713
SANTUCK	1,081
WARD 1 BOX 1	1,197
WARD 1 BOX 2	2,061
WARD 2	1,946
WARD 3	1,590
WARD 4 BOX 1	1,386
WARD 4 BOX 2	1,022
WEST SPRINGS	424

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 42

Area	**Population**
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,368
PERCENT VARIATION	0.889

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area	**Population**
Chester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BALDWIN MILL	
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 105B, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125B, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139B, 208B, 212B, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220	981
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 109B	0
BECKHAMVILLE	1,696
CHESTER WARD 1	
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203	36
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208A, 208B, 209A, 209B, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 513, 514, 515, 516A, 516B, 517A, 517B, 518	1,662

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area **Population**

CHESTER WARD 2

Tract 0202.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105A, 106, 125A, 126, 127, 128, 129, 139A, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208A, 209, 210, 211, 212A, 221A, 221B, 222A 1,188

CHESTER WARD 3

Tract 0201.00

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304A, 304B, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313A, 313B, 314A, 314B, 315A, 315B, 316, 317A, 317B, 318A, 318B, 319A, 319B, 320A, 320B, 321A, 321B, 322, 323A, 323B, 324A, 324B, 325, 326A, 326B, 327 ... 790

Tract 0202.00

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324A, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332 753

Tract 0206.00

Blocks: 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 429, 430, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 459, 460, 461, 462, 476, 477 725

CHESTER WARD 4

Tract 0201.00

Blocks: 111A, 121A, 121B, 122A, 123A, 123B, 124, 201A, 201B, 202A, 202B, 203A, 203B, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209A, 209B, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218 1,008

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area	Population
Tract 0202.00	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 406, 407, 408	138
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 402A, 403A, 404A, 405A, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 522A	553
EDGEMOOR	
Tract 0207.00	
Blocks: 107	0
Tract 0208.00	
Blocks: 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 160, 165, 166, 167, 168	1,255
EUREKA MILL	
Tract 0201.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111B, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122B	655
Tract 0203.00	
Blocks: 401, 402B, 403B, 404B, 405B, 511, 512, 519, 520, 521, 522B	389
Tract 0206.00	
Blocks: 562, 563	0
FORT LAWN	1,853
GREAT FALLS 1 AND 2	935
GREAT FALLS 3	1,071
LANDO	511
LANSFORD	743
RICHBURG	1,263

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area **Population**

RODMAN

Tract 0206.00

Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 428, 431 208

Tract 0207.00

Blocks: 134, 135, 137, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148 158

York County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CATAWBA 3,297

LESLIE NO 1

Tract 0013.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103 26

Tract 0612.01

Blocks: 101, 102B, 103, 104, 105, 106, 112, 113, 144, 145, 146, 203, 204, 205, 220, 221, 222, 223, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256 2,131

Tract 0612.02

Blocks: 102, 103 12

Tract 0612.03

Blocks: 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 314, 315 ... 215

Tract 0613.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108 61

LESSLIE [sic] NO 2 4,051

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,374

PERCENT VARIATION 0.910

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area **Population**

Kershaw County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BETHUNE

Tract 9701.00

Blocks: 114, 115, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197 815

BUFFALO 1,277

Lancaster County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ANTIOCH 1,089

CHARLESBORO 373

CHESTERFIELD AVENUE 1,678

DIXIE

Tract 0110.00

Blocks: 315, 316 256

DOUGLAS

Tract 0103.00

Blocks: 401, 402, 403 2

Tract 0104.00

Blocks: 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 144, 145, 146, 147, 161, 175, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area	Population
216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241	1,939
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 324, 325, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339	410
ELGIN	1,988
FLAT CREEK	258
FLINT RIDGE	363
FORK HILL	383
GOOCHS CROSS ROADS	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463	1,370
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 102, 105, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 119, 120, 121	471
HEATH SPRINGS	1,343
HYDE PARK	
Tract 0110.00	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 501, 502, 503, 507, 508, 513, 514, 515, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 606, 607, 609, 610, 611, 612	2,449
KERSHAW 1	823
KERSHAW 2	935

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area	**Population**
KERSHAW HEALTH CENTER	1,548
KERSHAW MILL	1,317
LYNWOOD DRIVE	2,554
MIDWAY	572
OAK RIDGE	902
PLEASANT HILL	765
PRIMUS	254
RICH HILL	454
THREE C5	285
TRADESVILLE	702
UNION	499
WELSHS	162
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,236
PERCENT VARIATION	0.420

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	**Population**
Lancaster County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BELAIRE	1,353
CAMP CREEK	974
CARMEL	584
DIXIE	
Tract 0110.00	
Blocks: 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 327, 328, 329	477

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	Population
DOUGLAS	
Tract 0103.00	
Blocks: 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495	373
Tract 0104.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179	96
DWIGHT	631
ERWIN FARM	2,341
GOOCHS CROSS ROADS	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504A, 504B, 504C, 504D, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509A, 509B, 509C, 509D, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524A, 524B, 525A, 525B, 525C	621
HYDE PARK	
Tract 0110.00	
Blocks: 504, 506, 509, 510, 511, 512, 516	176
JACKSONHAM	2,240
LANCASTER EAST	3,792
LANCASTER WEST	1,751
PLEASANT VALLEY	3,272
RIVERSIDE	1,678
SPRINGS MILL 1	1,194
SPRINGS MILL	1,344

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	**Population**
TABERNACLE	1,161
UNITY	1,070
VAN WYCK	871
WYLIE PARK	2,373
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,372
PERCENT VARIATION	0.903

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	**Population**
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
EBENEZER	2,615
EBINPORT	2,526
FEWELL PARK	1,470
HIGHLAND PARK	2,086
LESLIE NO 1	
Tract 0602.00	
Blocks: 124, 125	0
Tract 0612.01	
Blocks: 102A, 114A, 114B, 115, 116A, 116B, 117A, 117B, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213A, 213B, 224, 225	991

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area **Population**

MT GALLANT

Tract 0608.01

Blocks: 101A, 101B, 101C, 101D, 101E, 101F, 102A, 102B, 102C, 103A, 103B, 103C, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111A, 111B, 112, 113A, 113B, 114, 115A, 115B, 115C, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134A, 134B, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140A, 140B, 141 2,860

Tract 0609.01

Blocks: 101, 102, 103A, 103B, 104, 105, 106A, 106B, 107A, 107B, 107C, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116A, 116B, 116C, 116D, 117, 118, 119A, 119B, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124A, 124B, 124C, 125A, 125B, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 201A, 201B, 202, 203, 204A, 204B, 205A, 205B, 206A, 206B, 207, 208A, 208B, 209, 210, 211, 212A, 212B, 213, 214A, 214B, 215A, 215B, 215C, 216, 217A, 217B, 218A, 218B, 218C, 219A, 219B, 219C, 220, 221, 222, 223A, 223B, 224 1,713

NORTHSIDE 1,569

NORTHWESTERN

Tract 0605.01

Blocks: 136 0

Tract 0614.02

Blocks: 102A, 102B, 104A, 104B, 104C, 104D, 105, 106, 107, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126A, 126B 633

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	Population
ROCK HILL NO 1	1,040
ROCK HILL NO 4	
Tract 0601.02	
Blocks: 305	127
Tract 0607.00	
Blocks: 208, 209, 210, 221, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321	403
ROCK HILL NO 5	
Tract 0601.01	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 401, 402, 404	104
Tract 0601.02	
Blocks: 104A, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 202, 203, 209, 210, 211, 212, 219, 220, 221, 301, 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317	2,302
Tract 0605.01	
Blocks: 211	0
Tract 0606.00	
Blocks: 101, 104, 105	0
Tract 0607.00	
Blocks: 305	2
ROCK HILL NO 6	
Tract 0601.01	
Blocks: 419, 420, 423	18
Tract 0603.00	
Blocks: 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 227, 228, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 315, 317	2,138

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	**Population**
ROCK HILL NO 7	3,553
UNIVERSITY	2,093
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,243
PERCENT VARIATION	0.445

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 47

Area	**Population**
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETHEL NO 1	
Tract 0617.03	
Blocks: 160, 161, 162, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 186, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265	1,810
Tract 0617.04	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171	1,200

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 47

Area	Population
BOWLING GREEN	2,923
CANNON MILL	3,899
CLOVER NO 1	2,928
CLOVER NO 2	3,564
FILBERT	1,599
NEWPORT	3,294
NORTHWESTERN	
Tract 0614.02	
Blocks: 108A, 108B, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307	622
TIRZAH	1,604
YORK NO 1	
Tract 0616.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117A, 117B, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122A, 122B, 122C, 123A, 123B, 125, 126, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155	902
YORK NO 2	3,588
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,933
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.658

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 48

Area **Population**

York County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BETHEL NO 1

Tract 0617.04

Blocks: 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372 2,038

BETHEL NO 2 967

FORT MILL NO 1 3,289

FORT MILL NO 2 823

FORT MILL NO 3 3,210

FORT MILL NO 4 2,505

FORT MILL NO 5 2,351

FORT MILL NO 6 1,515

INDIA HOOK 1,270

MT GALLANT

Tract 0609.02

Blocks: 219A, 303A, 303C, 303D, 304, 305, 306, 307A, 307F, 307G, 308A, 308B, 309B, 309C, 309D, 313, 314, 315A, 316A, 316B 2,246

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 48

Area	**Population**
MUSEUM	4,478
TEGA CAY	3,650
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,342
PERCENT VARIATION	0.797

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 49

Area	**Population**
York County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DELPHIA	1,980
EDGEWOOD	2,457
MCCONNELLS	
Tract 0614.01	
Blocks: 201, 205, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214B, 247, 249, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262	284
MT HOLLY	2,023
OAK RIDGE	2,533
OGDEN	1,950
ROCK HILL NO 2	3,485
ROCK HILL NO 3	3,600
ROCK HILL NO 4	
Tract 0605.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122A, 122B, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130A, 130B, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 201, 202,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 49

Area	Population
203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 216, 217	1,834
Tract 0606.00	
Blocks: 102, 103	2,045
Tract 0609.05	
Blocks: 125A, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 201E, 202A, 202B, 203, 204A, 204B, 205	1,406
Tract 0614.02	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 101C, 101D, 103	87
ROCK HILL NO 5	
Tract 0601.01	
Blocks: 403	22
Tract 0605.01	
Blocks: 212, 213	45
ROCK HILL NO 6	
Tract 0013.01	
Blocks: 101	0
Tract 0603.00	
Blocks: 212, 213, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324	1,944
Tract 0612.01	
Blocks: 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 238	173
Tract 0613.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106A, 106B, 107, 108, 109, 110A, 110B, 111, 112A, 112C, 113, 114B	271
YORK NO 1	
Tract 0615.01	
Blocks: 244, 245, 267, 268, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286	148

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 49

Area	**Population**
Tract 0615.02	
Blocks: 325, 326, 327	57
Tract 0616.01	
Blocks: 108, 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131A, 131B, 131C, 132, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205A, 205B, 206, 207, 208, 209A, 209B, 209C, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222A, 222B, 223, 224, 225A, 225B, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231A, 231B, 231C, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244A, 244B	1,519
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,863
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.907

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 50

Area	**Population**
Lee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ASHWOOD	856
BISHOPVILLE 1	1,031
BISHOPVILLE 2	1,317
BISHOPVILLE 3	1,339
BISHOPVILLE 4	1,946
CEDAR CREEK	502
CYPRESS	667
ELLIOTT	808
HICKORY HILL	357
IONIA	904

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 50

Area	Population
LYNCHBURG	1,302
MANVILLE	775
MOUNT CLIO	504
RATTLESNAKE SPRINGS	534
SAINT CHARLES	1,426
SOUTH LYNCHBURG	722
SPRING HILL	794
STOKES BRIDGE	720
WOODROW	423

Sumter County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

DALZELL DUBOSE	3,954
HILLCREST	2,493
HORSEPEN BRANCH	1,985
OSWEGO	
Tract 0004.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569	695
REMBERT	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 50

Area	**Population**
248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297	1,965
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,019
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.352

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 51

Area	**Population**
Sumter County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BATES	1,495
BIRNIE	1,829
BROGDON	
Tract 0006.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 339, 340, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 416, 417, 418, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438	1,724

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 51

Area **Population**

CONCORD

Tract 0006.00

Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 419, 420, 439, 440 1,130

Tract 0011.00

Blocks: 608 8

LEMIRA 2,275

MAGNOLIA 1,107

MAYESVILLE 1,218

MCCRAYS MILL NORTH

Tract 0017.02

Blocks: 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 301A, 301B, 301C, 302, 303A, 303B, 304, 305, 306, 308A, 308B, 309 649

MCCRAYS MILL SOUTH

Tract 0017.02

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318 1,408

MILLWOOD

Tract 0017.01

Blocks: 201A, 201B, 202A, 202C, 202D, 208A, 209, 210A, 210B, 211, 213, 214, 215A, 215B, 216A, 216B, 217A, 217B, 218A, 218B, 219A, 219B, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231A, 231B, 232, 233A, 233B, 233C 1,370

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 51

Area	Population
MULBERRY	1,604
OLD POCALLA	1,655
OSWEGO	
Tract 0004.00	
Blocks: 509, 510, 531, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542	325
PLEASANT GROVE TRINITY	658
SALEM	659
SALTERSTOWN	1,665
SAVAGE GLOVER	1,188
SHILOH	495
SOUTH LIBERTY	
Tract 0013.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 215, 216, 516, 517, 519, 520	812
SOUTH RED BAY	1,662
STONE HILL	1,223
SUNSET	
Tract 0017.02	
Blocks: 401, 402A, 402B, 402C, 403, 404A, 404B, 404C, 405A, 405C, 406A, 406B, 406C, 406D, 407, 408A, 408B, 409, 420, 421, 422, 425, 426, 442, 443	1,135
TAYLORS	937
WILDER	1,085
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,316
PERCENT VARIATION	0.704

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 52

Area **Population**

Kershaw County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

AIRPORT....2,308
ANTIOCH....820
CAMDEN 1....1,356
CAMDEN 2....574
CAMDEN 3....1,008
CAMDEN 4....1,600
CAMDEN 5A....886
CAMDEN 5....562
CAMDEN 6....601
CASSATT
Tract 9701.00
Blocks: 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 173, 174, 175....134
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 280, 281....79
Tract 9705.00
Blocks: 151....0
Tract 9706.00
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 194, 195, 196, 197....802
CHARLOTTE THOMPSON....1,955
DOBYS MILL....1,295
EAST CAMDEN-HERMITAGE....929

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 52

Area	Population
GATES FORD	441
LIBERTY HILL	385
MALVERN HILL	1,908
RABONS CROSSROADS	1,671
RIVERDALE	1,629
SHAYLORS HILL	925
SPRINGDALE	2,269
WESTVILLE	2,123
WHITE GARDENS	2,015
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,295
PERCENT VARIATION	0.629

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 53

Area	Population
Chesterfield County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BAY SPRINGS	215
BLACK CREEK	187
BROCKS MILL	2,086
CASH	1,147
CAT POND	509
CENTER GROVE	539
CENTER POINT	260
CHERAW 1	2,153
CHERAW 2	5,282
CHERAW 3	1,969
COURT HOUSE	2,919

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 53

Area	Population
CROSS ROADS	217
GRANTS MILL	1,545
MCBEE	
Tract 9508.98	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110A, 110B, 111A, 111B, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139A, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 160, 163A, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168A, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243A, 243B, 244, 245, 246, 257, 258, 263A, 263B, 263C, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275A, 275B, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286A, 286B, 287, 288, 289A, 289B, 290, 291, 292, 293A, 293B, 296, 297	1,237
MIDDENDORF	604
MOUNT CROGHAN	299
OUSLEYDALE	712
PATRICK	1,034
PEE DEE	273
RUBY	1,115
SHILOH	853
SNOW HILL	354
VAUGHN	336
WEXFORD	359
WHITE OAK	469
WINZO	1,373

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 53

Area	**Population**
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,046
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.256

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 54

Area	**Population**
Marlboro County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADAMSVILLE	718
BLENHEIM	471
BRIGHTSVILLE	837
BROWNSVILLE	526
CLIO	2,825
EAST BENNETTSVILLE	7,431
EAST MCCOLL	1,649
MCCOLL	2,291
QUICKS CROSS ROADS	2,106
RED HILL	
Tract 9602.00	
Blocks: 802, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832	311
Tract 9606.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112	261
SOUTH BENNETTSVILLE	1,528
TATUM	618
WALLACE	1,821
WEST BENNETTSVILLE	4,910

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 54

Area	**Population**
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,303
PERCENT VARIATION	0.658

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 55

Area	**Population**
Dillon County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BERMUDA	437
CAROLINA	521
EAST DILLON	2,939
FLOYDALE	913
FORK	788
GADDY'S MILL	523
HAMER	1,201
KEMPER	643
LAKE VIEW	2,122
LATTA	
Tract 9706.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306A, 306B, 307, 308, 309A, 309B, 309C, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326A, 326B, 326C, 326D, 327, 328, 329A, 329B, 330, 331, 332, 333A, 333B, 334, 335, 336A, 336B, 337A, 337B, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359A, 359B, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373A, 373B, 374A, 374B, 401,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 55

Area	Population
402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413A, 413B, 414A, 414B, 415A, 415B, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428A, 429A, 430A, 431A, 432A, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441A, 442A, 445, 447, 451, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 526, 527, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 552, 553, 554, 652, 653, 654, 677, 678, 679	2,464
LITTLE ROCK	752
MANNING	671
MINTURN	472
MT. CALVARY	2,708
NEW HOLLY	666
OAK GROVE	1,057
OAKLAND	965
PLEASANT HILL	380
SOUTH DILLON	3,748
WEST DILLON	3,981
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,951
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.594

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 56

Area	Population
Darlington County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ANTIOCH	2,242
BURNT BRANCH BETHEL	2,836
CLYDE BLACK CREEK	
Tract 0102.00	
Blocks: 166	0
DARLINGTON 1	
Tract 0111.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 215, 216	170
DARLINGTON 3	4,279
DARLINGTON 6	2,433
DOVESVILLE	1,353
HARTSVILLE 4	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 349, 350, 351, 353, 354, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 382, 383, 384, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397	251
Tract 0108.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 207, 208, 209, 210	119
HARTSVILLE 7	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 210, 211, 212, 250, 251, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 352	926

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 56

Area	Population
Tract 0109.00	
Blocks: 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 158, 159, 160	194
HARTSVILLE 8A	2,968
HARTSVILLE 8B	2,515
MONT CLARE MECHANICSVILLE	
Tract 0101.00	
Blocks: 341, 343, 347, 349, 350, 352, 353, 354,357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397	268
Tract 0113.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 255, 256, 277, 280, 281, 282, 285, 286, 291, 295, 296, 297	1,331
OATS PHILADELPHIA	1,325
POND HOLLOW NEW MARKET	1,392
SOCIETY HILL	1,195
SWIFT CREEK	1,447

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 56

Area	**Population**
Marlboro County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
RED HILL	
Tract 9602.00	
Blocks: 162, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 826, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842	185
Tract 9606.00	
Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 107, 111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179	873
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,302
PERCENT VARIATION	0.654

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 57

Area	**Population**
Marion County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BRITTONS NECK	2,294
CENTENARY	1,788
FRIENDSHIP	409

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 57

Area	**Population**
MARION 1	2,122
MARION NORTH	1,351
MARION SOUTH	4,690
NICHOLS	1,341
NORTHEAST MULLINS	3,967
NORTHWEST MULLINS	3,254
RAINS	1,242
SOUTHEAST MULLINS	2,158
SOUTHWEST MULLINS	2,528
TEMPERANCE	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 543	0
ZION	793
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,937
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.644

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 58

Area	**Population**
Horry County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AYNOR	1,685
BAYBORO	1,274
BROWNWAY	1,111
CEDAR GROVE	773
COOL SPRINGS	622
DOG BLUFF	925
FLOYDS	820
FOUR MILE	1,516

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 58

Area	Population
GALIVANTS FERRY	258
GREEN SEA	1,659
HOMEWOOD	970
HORRY	879
JAMESTOWN	2,647
JORDANVILLE	525
JOYNER SWAMP	122
JUNIPER BAY	1,433
METHODIST RHEOBETH	577
MILL SWAMP	280
MOUNT OLIVE	582
NORTH CONWAY 1	1,341
NORTON	243
PLEASANT VIEW	385
POPLAR HILL	1,022
RACEPATH 1	1,566
RACEPATH 2	2,441
SPRING BRANCH	517
TAYLORSVILLE	487
WEST CONWAY	1,330
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,290
PERCENT VARIATION	0.612

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 59

Area **Population**

Dillon County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
LATTA
Tract 9706.00
Blocks: 428B, 429B, 430B, 431B, 432B, 441B, 442B, 443, 444A, 444B, 446, 448, 449, 450, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 528, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561 1,163

Florence County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
BACK SWAMP 1,234
BROOKGREEN
Tract 0003.00
Blocks: 202, 203, 210, 211B, 212B, 213 151
CLAUSSEN
Tract 0016.01
Blocks: 201A 0
Tract 0016.02
Blocks: 207 0
Tract 0017.00
Blocks: 132A, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180 932

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 59

Area	Population
FLORENCE WARD 10	
Tract 0003.00	
Blocks: 204, 211A, 211C, 211D, 212A, 214, 215A, 215B, 215C, 215D, 413A	392
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 101B, 603, 604, 605, 606, 619	151
FLORENCE WARD 1	2,415
FLORENCE WARD 9	
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 101A, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 201, 202, 203, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 621, 622	3,143
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 119, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142	0
GILBERT	
Tract 0005.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 207, 208	515
Tract 0007.00	
Blocks: 525	23
KINGSBURG	651
MARS BLUFF 1	3,883
MARS BLUFF 2	1,953
MILL BRANCH	819
PAMPLICO 2	1,255
QUINBY	1,249

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 59

Area	**Population**
SPAULDING	1,538
STONE	787
Marion County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
MARION 2	2,187
MARION WEST	1,839
SELLERS	590
TEMPERANCE	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 542, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568	1,346
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,216
PERCENT VARIATION	0.349

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 60

Area	**Population**
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BROOKGREEN	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 102, 107	106

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 60

Area	Population
CARTERSVILLE	1,619
EBENEZER	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 201, 202A, 202B, 202C, 202D, 203, 204, 205, 301A, 301B, 302, 303A, 303B, 304A, 304B, 304C, 304D, 305, 306A, 306B, 307A, 307B, 308, 309A, 309B, 310, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405A, 405B, 406, 407, 408, 409, 501, 502A, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508	2,684
Tract 0015.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206A, 206B, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 301, 406, 407, 409	1,331
ELIM	617
GLENWOOD	1,777
GREENWOOD	4,202
OAK GROVE	859
OLANTA	2,296
SALEM	903
SARDIS	477
SAVANNAH GROVE	2,787
TANS BAY	2,108
TIMMONSVILLE	4,642
WEST FLORENCE	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135	1,551

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 60

Area	**Population**
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,959
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.565

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 61

Area	**Population**
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CLAUSSEN	
Tract 0016.02	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245	405
COWARDS 1	1,110
COWARDS 2	1,264
EFFINGHAM	1,322
EVERGREEN	1,404
FRIENDFIELD	728
HANNAH	999
HIGHHILL	777
JOHNSONVILLE	3,543
LAKE CITY 1	2,397
LAKE CITY 2	1,561
LAKE CITY 3	2,413
LAKE CITY 4	3,443
LEO	1,021
MCALLISTER MILL	1,150

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 61

Area	**Population**
PAMPLICO 1	1,464
PROSPECT	820
SCRANTON	1,619
VOX	740
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,180
PERCENT VARIATION	0.220

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 62

Area	**Population**
Darlington County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DARLINGTON 1	
Tract 0111.00	
Blocks: 212, 214, 217, 218, 301, 310, 311, 325	321
DARLINGTON 2	2,645
DARLINGTON 4	2,349
DARLINGTON 5	2,871
HIGH HILL INDIAN BRANCH	3,268
LAKE SWAMP	1,588
LAMAR 1	1,308
LAMAR 2 NEWMAN SWAMP	2,078
MONT CLARE MECHANICSVILLE	
Tract 0113.00	
Blocks: 218, 219, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 251, 252, 253, 254, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 62

Area	Population
270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 301	376
PALMETTO	2,856
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BROOKGREEN	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 101	0
Tract 0003.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121B, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209	907
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 601B, 602	0
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 101B, 113B	0
FLORENCE WARD 10	
Tract 0003.00	
Blocks: 121A, 122	6
Tract 0008.00	
Blocks: 601A, 620	0
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 101A, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113A, 114, 115, 116, 117, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130	1,029
FLORENCE WARD 2	2,606
FLORENCE WARD 3	3,001
FLORENCE WARD 9	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 118, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139	2

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 62

Area	**Population**
Tract 0010.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110	170
GILBERT	
Tract 0007.00	
Blocks: 223B, 301B, 301C, 302B, 303B, 304B, 304C, 317B, 318A, 318B, 319B, 319C, 321, 322, 323A, 323B, 323C, 506B, 507B, 508, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517B, 518, 519C, 520B, 521B, 521C, 522, 523, 524	1,014
Tract 0010.00	
Blocks: 126B, 132B	0
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,395
PERCENT VARIATION	0.985

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 63

Area	**Population**
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
COLES CROSS ROADS	3,191
DELMAE	4,218
EBENEZER	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 502B	0
Tract 0002.01	
Blocks: 315, 316, 317B, 318, 319	12
Tract 0002.02	
Blocks: 101B, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113	776

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 63

Area	Population
Tract 0011.00	
Blocks: 706C	0
Tract 0015.01	
Blocks: 404, 405	2
FLORENCE WARD 11	1,621
FLORENCE WARD 12	2,038
FLORENCE WARD 14	3,037
FLORENCE WARD 15	2,172
FORENCE WARD 4	1,394
FLORENCE WARD 5	2,071
FLORENCE WARD 6	1,032
FLORENCE WARD 7	1,763
FLORENCE WARD 8	2,064
GILBERT	
Tract 0005.00	
Blocks: 201B, 201C, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206A, 206B, 209	864
Tract 0007.00	
Blocks: 403C, 405A, 405B, 406B, 407B, 412B	118
WEST FLORENCE	
Tract 0002.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105A, 105B, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 301B, 302C, 303D, 303E, 303F, 303G, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 311B, 313B, 314	2,006
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,379
PERCENT VARIATION	0.928

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 64

Area	**Population**
Clarendon County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALCOLU	1,361
BARRINEAU	770
BARROWS MILL	261
BLOOMVILLE	498
DAVIS STATION	1,621
HARMONY	958
HICKS	1,205
HOME BRANCH	473
JORDAN	1,408
MANNING 1	1,084
MANNING 2	1,481
MANNING 3	1,388
MANNING 4	2,716
MANNING 5	1,340
NEW ZION	676
OAKDALE	292
PANOLA	550
SARDINIA GABLE	554
SUMMERTON 1	1,939
SUMMERTON 2	920
SUMMERTON 3	2,000
TURBEVILLE	1,242
WILSON FORESTON	1,622
Williamsburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLACK RIVER	488

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 64

Area	**Population**
KINGSTREE 1	
Tract 9706.00	
Blocks: 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 615, 616	344
MOUNT VERNON	581
WORKMAN	96
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,868
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.889

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 65

Area	**Population**
Chesterfield County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ANGELUS CATARRAH	353
DUDLEY	683
JEFFERSON	2,420
MANGUM	672
MCBEE	
Tract 9508.98	
Blocks: 139B, 152, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163B, 168B, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186B, 187B, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196B, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 247,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 65

Area **Population**

248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255,
256, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263D, 294, 295 . . 1,094

PAGELAND 5,309

Darlington County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CLYDE BLACK CREEK

Tract 0102.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107,
108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115,
116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123,
124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131,
132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139,
140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147,
148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155,
156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163,
164, 165, 167, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176,
177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184,
185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192,
193, 194, 195, 196, 197 977

Tract 0104.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107,
108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115,
136, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174,
175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182,
183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190,
191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196 534

Tract 0117.98

Blocks: 186A, 187A, 196A, 197. 0

HARTSVILLE 1. 1,216

HARTSVILLE 2&3 1,143

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 65

Area **Population**

HARTSVILLE 4

Tract 0106.00

Blocks: 151, 153, 155, 156, 157, 162A, 162B, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186A, 186B, 187A, 187B, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195A, 195B, 196, 197, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 385, 386, 387A, 387B, 388A, 388B, 389, 390, 391, 392 897

Tract 0107.00

Blocks: 112, 113, 201A, 201B, 301A, 301B, 401 172

HARTSVILLE 5 3,568

HARTSVILLE 6 3,556

HARTSVILLE 7

Tract 0106.00

Blocks: 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 160, 161, 208, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216A, 216B, 220A, 220B, 221A, 221B, 222, 223, 224, 225A, 225B, 226A, 226B, 228, 229A, 229B, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 252A, 252B, 253A, 253B 894

KELLYTOWN 1,990

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 65

Area **Population**

Kershaw County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BETHUNE

Tract 9701.00

Blocks: 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206A, 206B, 207A, 207B, 207C, 208A, 208B, 209, 210A, 210B, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215A, 215B, 216A, 216B, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229A, 229B, 230A, 230B, 231A, 231B, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237A, 237B, 238A, 238B, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257A, 257B, 258A, 258B, 259A, 259B, 260, 261A, 261B, 262, 263A, 263B, 264A, 264B, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296A, 296B, 297A, 297B 1,062

CASSATT

Tract 9701.00

Blocks: 170, 171, 172, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189 208

Tract 9706.00

Blocks: 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178..... 93

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 65

Area	**Population**
Lee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ASHLAND	233
LUCKNOW	648
SHROCKS MILL	108
ST MATTHEWS	241
TURKEY CREEK	80
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,351
PERCENT VARIATION	0.829

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 66

Area	**Population**
Colleton County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
EDISTO	524
SMOAKS	1,332
WILLIAMS	516
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
REEVESVILLE	
Tract 0101.00	
Blocks: 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173	187

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 66

Area	Population
Orangeburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETHEL	809
EAST HOLLY HILL	2,770
NORTH BOWMAN	2,353
NORTH BRANCHVILLE	1,400
NORTH EUTAWVILLE	1,985
ORANGEBURG WARD 2	
Tract 0113.00	
Blocks: 116, 117, 118, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144	341
ORANGEBURG WARD 3	1,098
ORANGEBURG WARD 4	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 301A, 302, 303, 304A, 305A	49
Tract 0107.00	
Blocks: 312, 313, 314A, 316, 317, 318	85
PROVIDENCE	1,983
ROWESVILLE	725
SOUTH BOWMAN	1,243
SOUTH BRANCHVILLE	785
SOUTH EUTAWVILLE	2,273
SUBURBAN 2	
Tract 0107.00	
Blocks: 310, 311, 314B, 315, 319A, 319B, 320	57
SUBURBAN 3	2,122
SUBURBAN 4	978
VANCE	1,817
WEST HOLLY HILL	2,707

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 66

Area **Population**

WHITTAKER
Tract 0107.00
Blocks: 232, 233, 234, 260 37

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,176

PERCENT VARIATION 0.206

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 67

Area **Population**

Clarendon County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
CALVARY 961
PAXVILLE 1,130

Sumter County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
BROGDON
Tract 0006.00
Blocks: 312, 313, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 341, 342, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363 284
CAUSEWAY BRANCH 2,126
CONCORD
Tract 0006.00
Blocks: 117, 118, 127, 128, 132, 133, 136, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233 613

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 67

Area **Population**

DELAINE

Tract 0017.01

Blocks: 102A, 102B, 102C, 102D, 103, 104A, 104B, 104C, 104D, 104E, 123, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147 150

Tract 0018.02

Blocks: 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 131, 132, 136, 137, 138, 139, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150A, 151, 152A, 152B, 152C, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166A, 169, 173, 176, 211, 212, 213, 301A 1,669

MANCHESTER FOREST

Tract 0017.02

Blocks: 104, 106, 110, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129 149

Tract 0018.01

Blocks: 203, 204, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266, 267, 268, 270, 295 412

Tract 0019.01

Blocks: 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 349, 350, 351, 352, 401, 402 227

MCCRAYS MILL NORTH

Tract 0017.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123 1,335

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 67

Area	Population
MCCRAYS MILL SOUTH	
Tract 0017.02	
Blocks: 124, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143	828
MILLWOOD	
Tract 0017.01	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 101C, 105A, 105B, 106A, 106B, 106C, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111A, 111B, 112A, 112B, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120A, 120B, 120C, 120D, 121, 131, 133, 149, 150, 203, 204A, 204B, 205, 206, 212	1,361
PINEWOOD	1,645
POCOTALIGO	3,966
PRIVATEER	3,743
SHAW 10	6,695
SHAW 11	0
SHAW 13	0
SHAW 14	0
SHAW 16	0
SUNSET	
Tract 0017.02	
Blocks: 405B, 405D, 410, 411, 412A, 412B, 413A, 413B, 414A, 414B, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 423, 424, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441	733
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,027
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.324

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 68

Area	**Population**
Sumter County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BURNS DOWNS	975
CHERRYVALE	1,935
CROSSWELL	2,634
FOLSOM PARK	2,990
GREEN SWAMP	2,525
HAMPTON PARK	1,232
LORING	2,074
MORRIS COLLEGE	2,505
PALMETTO PARK	2,203
SECOND MILL	1,266
SHAW 12	0
SHAW 15	0
SHAW 1	1,260
SHAW 2	339
SHAW 3	407
SHAW 4	430
SHAW 5	394
SHAW 6	281
SHAW 7	1,908
SHAW 8	625
SHAW 9	229
SOUTH LIBERTY	
Tract 0013.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 301, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 506, 507, 508, 509, 514, 515	470
SWAN LAKE	1,432
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,114
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.014

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 69

Area **Population**

Lexington County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CROMER

Tract 0210.07

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321 4,514

Tract 0210.08

Blocks: 203, 204, 205 18

GARDENDALE 1,199

JAMIL ROAD 4,603

LEAPHART ROAD 2,426

LEXINGTON 1

Tract 0205.06

Blocks: 103, 104, 105, 106, 107 88

Tract 0210.06

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128A, 128B, 129, 130, 131, 201A, 201B, 201C, 201D, 202A, 202B, 202C, 203A, 203B, 203C, 203D, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 301A, 301B, 301C, 301D, 302, 303A, 303B, 303C, 304A, 304B, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310A, 310B, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 69

Area	**Population**
316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325	4,638
PINEVIEW	3,526
QUAIL HOLLOW	2,325
SEVEN OAKS	2,096
WOODLAND HILLS	2,462
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,895
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.793

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 70

Area	**Population**
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLUFF	
Tract 0117.02	
Blocks: 122, 123, 310, 311, 312, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320	220
EASTOVER	3,897
FJ 17	2,109
FJ 18	0
FJ 19	0
FJ 20	0
FJ 4	475
FJ 5	72
FJ 6	7
FJ 7	0
FJ 8	3,073
FJ 9	0

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 70

Area	Population
GADSDEN	2,563
GARNERS	1,131
HOPKINS	4,266
HUNTING CREEK	493
OLYMPIA	
Tract 0117.01	
Blocks: 115, 119, 120, 123, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 909, 910, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922	110
Tract 0117.02	
Blocks: 220, 221	0
PONTIAC	
Tract 0114.05	
Blocks: 419, 420, 432, 433, 434, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449	237
Tract 0120.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117	35
Sumter County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DELAINE	
Tract 0017.01	
Blocks: 148	0
Tract 0018.02	
Blocks: 148, 149, 150B, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 170, 174, 175, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 301B, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339,	

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 70

Area **Population**

340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397 2,159

Tract 1802.00

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322 0

HORATIO 752

MANCHESTER FOREST

Tract 0017.02

Blocks: 105, 107, 108, 109 215

Tract 0018.01

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211 1,082

Tract 0019.01

Blocks: 105, 106, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 111

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 70

Area	Population
OAKLAND PLANTATION	3,574
REMBERT	
Tract 0001.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112A, 112B, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197	1,286
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,867
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.893

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 71

Area	Population
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BALLENTINE	3,358
HARBISON	4,609
KINGSWOOD	
Tract 0104.06	
Blocks: 222, 223, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415	2,437

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 71

Area	Population
NEW FRIARSGATE	5,227
OLD FRIARSGATE	2,137
SPRINGVILLE	3,226
WALDEN	
Tract 0103.03	
Blocks: 172A, 172B, 173	4
Tract 0103.04	
Blocks: 304, 305B, 308, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410A, 410B, 411A, 411B, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417A, 417B, 418, 419A, 419B, 420A, 420B, 421, 422, 423A, 423B, 424, 425, 426A, 427A, 428A, 428B	1,083
WHITEWELL	
Tract 0104.05	
Blocks: 107, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 212, 231, 232, 301, 302, 303, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 501, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607	5,813
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,894
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.797

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 72

Area	Population
Richland County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARDINCAPLE	832
RIDGEWOOD	1,933

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 30

Area	**Population**
Tract 9606.00	
Blocks: 229	0
EAST BENNETTSVILLE	7,431
TATUM	618
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,725
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.096

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 31

Area	**Population**
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BACK SWAMP	1,234
BROOKGREEN	1,164
COLES CROSS ROADS	3,191
COWARDS 1	1,110
COWARDS 2	1,264
DELMAE	4,218
EBENEZER	4,805
EFFINGHAM	1,322
ELIM	617
EVERGREEN	1,404
FLORENCE WARD 11	1,621
FLORENCE WARD 12	2,038
FLORENCE WARD 14	3,037
FLORENCE WARD 15	2,172
FLORENCE WARD 4	1,394
FLORENCE WARD 5	2,071
FLORENCE WARD 6	1,032

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 31

Area	Population
FLORENCE WARD 7	1,763
FLORENCE WARD 8	2,064
FRIENDFIELD	728
GLENWOOD	1,777
GREENWOOD	4,202
HANNAH	999
HIGHHILL	777
JOHNSONVILLE	3,543
MARS BLUFF 2	1,953
MCALLISTER MILL	1,150
OAK GROVE	859
OLANTA	2,296
PAMPLICO 1	1,464
PROSPECT	820
QUINBY	1,249
SALEM	903
SARDIS	477
SAVANNAH GROVE	2,787
SCRANTON	1,619
TANS BAY	2,108
TIMMONSVILLE	4,642
VOX	740
WEST FLORENCE	3,557
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,171
PERCENT VARIATION	0.492

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 32

Area	Population
Berkeley County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALVIN	1,205
CROSS	2,738
EADYTOWN	983
RUSSELLVILLE	1,941
SAINT STEPHEN	4,223
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
LAKE CITY 1	2,397
LAKE CITY 2	1,561
LAKE CITY 3	2,413
LAKE CITY 4	3,443
LEO	1,021
Georgetown County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ANDREWS OUTSIDE	1,791
ANDREWS	3,038
CEDAR CREEK	746
FOLLY GROVE	1,121
Marion County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BRITTONS NECK	2,294
CENTENARY	1,788
FRIENDSHIP	409
RAINS	1,242
SOUTHEAST MULLINS	2,158
SOUTHWEST MULLINS	2,528

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 32

Area	Population
Williamsburg County	36,815
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,855
PERCENT VARIATION	0.075

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 33

Area	Population
Horry County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
COASTAL LANE 1	1,392
COASTAL LANE 2	3,096
DUNES 1	2,923
EAST CONWAY	1,587
GARDEN CITY 1	2,323
GARDEN CITY 2	1,291
GARDEN CITY 3	3,592
JET PORT	6,971
MAPLE	938
MARLOWE	3,279
MYRTLEWOOD 1	1,743
MYRTLEWOOD 2	2,186
MYRTLEWOOD 3	364
NORTH CONWAY 1	1,341
NORTH CONWAY 2	1,425
OCEAN FOREST 1	1,636
OCEAN FOREST 3	1,957
RED HILL 2	2,848
SALEM	1,361
SEA OATS 1	5,020

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 33

Area	**Population**
SEA OATS 2	2,092
SOCASTEE 1	7,805
SOCASTEE 2	2,655
SOCASTEE 3	3,885
SURFSIDE BEACH 1	2,191
SURFSIDE BEACH 2	1,563
SURFSIDE BEACH 3	1,416
SURFSIDE BEACH 4	4,337
TILLY SWAMP	757
WEST CONWAY	1,330
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,304
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.652

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area	**Population**
Berkeley County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CAINHOY	
Tract 0204.02	
Blocks: 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 151, 152, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212,	

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area	Population
213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 283, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291	2,293
GOOSE CREEK 2	
Tract 0207.03	
Blocks: 907, 908, 909A, 909B, 909C, 909D, 909E, 909F, 909G, 909H, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915A, 915B, 915C, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944	10,981
Tract 0208.01	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 603	3,772
Tract 0208.02	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 301A, 307B, 308, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327	2,405
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AWENDAW	1,276
CHRIST CHURCH 4	793

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area	Population
CHRIST CHURCH 5	1,682
MCCLELLANVILLE 1	852
MCCLELLANVILLE 2	339
ST JAMES - SANTEE	1,157

Georgetown County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BETHEL	1,247
BLACK RIVER	1,315
BROWNS FERRY	2,281
CARVERS BAY	166
CHOPPEE	1,557
GEORGETOWN 1	1,428
GEORGETOWN 2	726
GEORGETOWN 3	2,756
GEORGETOWN 4	769
GEORGETOWN 5	2,538
GEORGETOWN 6	663
GEORGETOWN 7	560
GRIERS	709
KENSINGTON	1,803
MURRELLS INLET	4,436
MYERSVILLE	463
PAWLEYS ISLAND 1	1,387
PAWLEYS ISLAND 2	1,679
PAWLEYS ISLAND 3	1,300
PAWLEYS ISLAND 4	971
PENNY ROYAL	959
PLANTERSVILLE	916
PLEASANT HILL	1,344
POTATO BED FERRY	694
SAMPIT	1,413

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 34

Area	Population
SANTEE	1,425
SPRING GULLEY	3,210
WINYAH BAY	891
Horry County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BROWNWAY	1,111
INLAND	355
JAMESTOWN	2,647
PAWLEYS SWAMP	519
PORT HARRELSON	1,046
RED HILL 1	4,043
TODDVILLE	973
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,850
PERCENT VARIATION	0.069

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area	Population
Sumter County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BURNS DOWNS	975
CAUSEWAY BRANCH	2,126
CHERRYVALE	1,935
CROSSWELL	2,634
DALZELL DUBOSE	3,954
DELAINE	3,978
FOLSOM PARK	2,990
GREEN SWAMP	2,525
HAMPTON PARK	1,232

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area	Population
HILLCREST	2,493
HORATIO	752
HORSEPEN BRANCH	1,985
LEMIRA	
Tract 0007.00	
Blocks: 403	0
Tract 0011.00	
Blocks: 201, 202A, 202B, 203A, 203B, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213A, 214A, 215A, 216, 217, 301, 302B, 505, 506, 602A	860
MANCHESTER FOREST	2,196
MCCRAYS MILL NORTH	1,984
MCCRAYS MILL SOUTH	2,236
MILLWOOD	2,731
MULBERRY	1,604
OAKLAND PLANTATION	3,574
OSWEGO	1,020
PALMETTO PARK	2,203
POCOTALIGO	3,966
PRIVATEER	3,743
REMBERT	3,251
SALTERSTOWN	1,665
SECOND MILL	1,266
SHAW 10	6,695
SHAW 11	0
SHAW 12	0
SHAW 13	0
SHAW 14	0
SHAW 15	0
SHAW 16	0
SHAW 1	1,260
SHAW 2	339

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 35

Area	Population
SHAW 3	407
SHAW 4	430
SHAW 5	394
SHAW 6	281
SHAW 7	1,908
SHAW 8	625
SHAW 9	229
SUNSET	1,868
SWAN LAKE	1,432
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,746
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.069

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 36

Area	Population
Clarendon County	28,450
Florence County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CARTERSVILLE	1,619
Lee County	18,437
Sumter County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BATES	1,495
BIRNIE	1,829
BROGDON	2,008
CONCORD	1,751

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 36

Area	Population
LEMIRA	
Tract 0006.00	
Blocks: 101, 102	16
Tract 0011.00	
Blocks: 401B, 402B, 410, 411, 412, 514, 515A, 515B, 515C, 515D, 515E, 516A, 516B, 517, 518, 519A, 519B, 520A, 520B, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 601, 602B, 603A, 603B, 604, 605, 606, 607	1,399
Tract 0016.00	
Blocks: 501, 502	0
LORING	2,074
MAGNOLIA	1,107
MAYESVILLE	1,218
MORRIS COLLEGE	2,505
OLD POCALLA	655
PINEWOOD	1,645
PLEASANT GROVE TRINITY	658
SALEM	659
SAVAGE GLOVER	1,188
SHILOH	495
SOUTH LIBERTY	1,282
SOUTH RED BAY	1,662
STONE HILL	1,223
TAYLORS	937
WILDER	1,085
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,397
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.529

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area	Population
Berkeley County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BERKELEY	2,461
BETHERA	357
BONNEAU	2,692
CARNES CROSS ROADS	5,180
CORDESVILLE	1,407
GOOSE CREEK 1	8,764
GOOSE CREEK 2	
Tract 0208.02	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114A, 114B, 116A, 116B, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 301B, 302, 303A, 303B, 304A, 304B, 304C, 305, 306, 307A, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316	3,405
HANAHAN	
Tract 0208.02	
Blocks: 118	0
HILTON CROSS ROAD	2,330
HUGER	1,269
JAMESTOWN	760
LEBANON	678
MACEDONIA	2,229
MCBETH	1,169
MONCKS CORNER	9,896
PIMLICO	1,268
PINOPOLIS	1,966
SHULERVILLE HH	433
WASSAMASSAW	2,804

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area	Population
Colleton County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CANADY'S	602
COTTAGEVILLE	2,614
HORSE PEN	608
MAPLE CANE	677
PEOPLES	497
ROUND O	657
SIDNEY	390
WALTERBORO 4	4,006
WOLFE CREEK	505
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
FLOWERTOWN	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 261, 262, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 321, 322, 323, 324, 335, 336	1,468
FOUR HOLE	1,428
GREENWAVE	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 317, 325, 326, 327, 328, 330	398
GROVER NO.1	890
GROVER NO.3	221
HARLEYVILLE	980
KNIGHTSVILLE	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 110, 113, 115, 127, 128, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229,	

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 37

Area	Population
230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 318, 319, 320	3,899
RIDGEVILLE	3,332
ROSSES	889
ST. GEORGE NO.1	2,248
ST. GEORGE NO.2	714
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,141
PERCENT VARIATION	0.453

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 38

Area	Population
Berkeley County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
GOOSE CREEK 3	7,511
WIDE AWAKE	21,702
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
LADSON	3,133
LINCOLNVILLE	1,050
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CAROLINA	2,242
CLEMSON	2,495

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 38

Area	Population
COASTAL	6,608
DORCHESTER	2,633
FLOWERTOWN	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 719A, 719B, 720, 721A, 721B, 721C, 722, 723, 724A, 724B	1,034
GERMAN TOWN	1,685
GREENWAVE	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 401A, 401B, 401C, 401D, 401E, 401F, 402, 403, 404, 405A, 405B, 406A, 406B, 406C, 406D, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413	2,253
IRONGATE	4,530
KNIGHTSVILLE	
Tract 0105.00	
Blocks: 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 129, 130	284
NEWINGTON	2,760
NORTH SUMMERVILLE	2,772
SPANN	1,231
STALLSVILLE	1,580
TRANQUIL	2,686
TROLLEY	4,115
TUPPERWAY	4,183
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,487
PERCENT VARIATION	0.909

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 39

Area **Population**

Allendale County 11,722

Bamberg County 16,902

Barnwell County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
BARNWELL 2
Tract 9701.00
Blocks: 169, 170, 171, 172, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185 118
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 455 18
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 402, 424 23
Tract 9704.98
Blocks: 401, 402, 403B, 404, 405 92
BARNWELL 3
Tract 9704.98
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 217, 218, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305 279
BLACKVILLE 1
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 224, 225, 226, 229, 230, 231, 414, 415B, 416, 417, 418B, 419B, 420B, 420C, 421B, 434C, 439B, 440B, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450B, 452, 453, 454, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466C, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471 254
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 401, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423 107
BLACKVILLE 2
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 340, 341B, 342, 343 24

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 39

Area	Population
ELKO	
Tract 9701.00	
Blocks: 164, 165, 168	20
Tract 9702.00	
Blocks: 221, 222, 223, 227, 228, 232, 233	7
FRIENDSHIP	663
HILDA	1,260
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
INDIAN FIELD	1,972
REEVESVILLE	1,338
ROSINVILLE	1,819
Hampton County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BRUNSON	1,090
CROCKETVILLE MILEY	699
ESTILL	3,909
GARNETT	235
GIFFORD	483
HAMPTON COURTHOUSE 1	1,803
HAMPTON COURTHOUSE 2	1,980
RIVERS MILL	169
SCOTIA	481
VARNVILLE	2,614
Orangeburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
EAST HOLLY HILL	2,770
EDISTO	1,276
ELCOREE	2,534
NORTH BOWMAN	2,353
NORTH BRANCHVILLE	1,400

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 39

Area	Population
NORTH EUTAWVILLE	1,985
PROVIDENCE	1,983
SANTEE	2,726
SOUTH BOWMAN	1,243
SOUTH BRANCHVILLE	785
SOUTH EUTAWVILLE	2,273
VANCE	1,817
WEST HOLLY HILL	2,707
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,933
PERCENT VARIATION	0.178

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area	Population
Barnwell County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BARNWELL 1	1,200
BARNWELL 2	
Tract 9701.00	
Blocks: 180	1
Tract 9703.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 336, 337, 403, 404, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416A, 416B, 416C, 416D, 417, 418, 425, 426, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432A, 432B, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 448, 450A, 450B	990

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area **Population**

Tract 9704.98

Blocks: 403A, 406A, 406B, 407, 408A, 408B, 409A, 409B, 410, 411A, 411B, 412A, 412B, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445 1,025

BARNWELL 3

Tract 9704.98

Blocks: 306A, 306B, 307A, 307B, 308, 309A, 309B, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333A, 333B, 334A, 334B, 335, 336A, 336B, 337A, 337B, 338A, 338B, 339A, 339B, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353A, 353B, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359..... 1,196

Tract 9705.00

Blocks: 103, 104, 107, 113, 114, 115, 116, 132, 163, 164 240

BARNWELL 4 2,217

BLACKVILLE 1

Tract 9702.00

Blocks: 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 210, 211A, 211B, 212A, 212B, 212C, 213A, 213B, 214, 218, 219, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 243, 244, 245, 256, 257, 258, 259, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 402, 403, 404, 405, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413A, 413B, 415A, 418A, 419A, 420A, 421A,

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area **Population**

422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427A, 427B, 427C, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434A, 434B, 435, 436A, 436B, 437, 438, 439A, 440A, 450A, 451, 466A, 466B.....1,272

Tract 9703.00

Blocks: 427 0

BLACKVILLE 2

Tract 9702.00

Blocks: 201, 206, 207, 208, 241, 242, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 276, 277, 278, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307A, 307B, 308A, 308B, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320A, 320B, 321, 322A, 322B, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329A, 329B, 330, 331, 332A, 332B, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 341A, 401, 406.....1,074

ELKO

Tract 9701.00

Blocks: 111, 112, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125A, 125B, 126A, 126B, 126C, 127, 128, 129A, 129B, 130A, 130B, 131, 132A, 132B, 133A, 133B, 134A, 134B, 135A, 135B, 136A, 136B, 137A, 137B, 138, 139A, 139B, 140A, 140B, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152A, 152B, 153, 154, 155A, 155B, 156A, 156B, 157A, 157B, 158A, 158B, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166, 167..... 708

Tract 9702.00

Blocks: 133, 134, 182, 215, 216, 217, 220 23

HEALING SPRINGS.....1,536

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area	Population
KLINE	885
SNEELING	1,069
WILLISTON 1	1,665
WILLISTON 2	804
WILLISTON 3	1,523
Orangeburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETHEL	809
BROOKDALE	1,152
COPE	815
COROOVA	4,171
EAST NORTH	1,581
EAST SPRINGFIELD	917
FOUR HOLES	864
JAMISON	1,965
LIMESTONE	2,775
NEESES-LIVINGSTON	1,784
NIX	3,098
NORWAY	1,977
ORANGEBURG WARD 10	1,103
ORANGEBURG WARD 1	1,246
ORANGEBURG WARD 2	1,426
ORANGEBURG WARD 3	1,098
ORANGEBURG WARD 4	3,969
ORANGEBURG WARD 5	938
ORANGEBURG WARD 6	1,357
ORANGEBURG WARD 7	887
ORANGEBURG WARD 8	788
ORANGEBURG WARD 9	797
PINEHILL-BOLEN	2,394
ROWESVILLE	725
SUBURBAN 1	1,670

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 40

Area	Population
SUBURBAN 2	1,699
SUBURBAN 3	2,122
SUBURBAN 4	978
SUBURBAN 5	1,951
SUBURBAN 6	1,789
SUBURBAN 7	1,890
SUBURBAN 8	1,039
SUBURBAN 9	2,383
WEST NORTH	1,838
WEST SPRINGFIELD	858
WHITTAKER	2,098
DISTRICT TOTAL	76,379
PERCENT VARIATION	0.767

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 41

Area	Population
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
JAMES ISLAND 10	1,718
JAMES ISLAND 13	965
JAMES ISLAND 14	1,223
JAMES ISLAND 15	2,259
JAMES ISLAND 16	594
JAMES ISLAND 18	496
JAMES ISLAND 19	749
JAMES ISLAND 20	1,507
JAMES ISLAND 21	1,372
JAMES ISLAND 22	1,809

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 41

Area	Population
JAMES ISLAND 9	2,110
NORTH CHARLESTON 13	3,617
NORTH CHARLESTON 14	4,852
SAINT ANDREWS 10	1,082
SAINT ANDREWS 15	871
SAINT ANDREWS 16	1,567
SAINT ANDREWS 17	2,193
SAINT ANDREWS 18	990
SAINT ANDREWS 19	1,966
SAINT ANDREWS 23	2,181
SAINT ANDREWS 26	1,004
SAINT ANDREWS 27	2,781
SAINT ANDREWS 28	2,294
SAINT ANDREWS 29	3,146
SAINT ANDREWS 31	5,830
SAINT ANDREWS 32	3,670
SAINT ANDREWS 4	1,718
SAINT ANDREWS 5	1,418
SAINT ANDREWS 6	288
SAINT ANDREWS 7	1,627
SAINT ANDREWS 8	1,067
SAINT ANDREWS 9	1,065
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ASHBOROUGH	4,007
BEECH HILL	1,160
GREGG	10,744
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,940
PERCENT VARIATION	0.187

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 42

Area	Population
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 10	182
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 11	90
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 12	314
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 13	398
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 14	309
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 15	172
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 16	0
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 17	346
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 18	0
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 19	0
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 1	0
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 20	0
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 2	617
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 3	704
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 4	524
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 5	19
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 6	305
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 7	116
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 8	120
AIR FORCE BASE NO. 9	62
CHARLESTON 10	1,743
CHARLESTON 16	984
CHARLESTON 17	1,676
CHARLESTON 18	1,469
CHARLESTON 19	2,864
CHARLESTON 20	1,570
CHARLESTON 21	1,338
CHARLESTON 25	1,552
CHARLESTON 26	952
CHARLESTON 27	994

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 42

Area	Population
CHARLESTON 28	992
CHARLESTON 29	1,047
CHARLESTON 30	2,795
CHARLESTON 8	1,438
CHARLESTON 9	1,123
NORTH CHARLESTON 4	1,481
NORTH CHARLESTON 10	1,265
NORTH CHARLESTON 11	2,091
NORTH CHARLESTON 12	4,176
NORTH CHARLESTON 18	
Tract 0036.00	
Blocks: 314, 315, 316, 317	443
NORTH CHARLESTON 1	3,431
NORTH CHARLESTON 28	1,155
NORTH CHARLESTON 2	1,080
NORTH CHARLESTON 3	2,945
NORTH CHARLESTON 5	1,952
NORTH CHARLESTON 6	1,767
NORTH CHARLESTON 7	2,072
NORTH CHARLESTON 8	1,533
NORTH CHARLESTON 9	3,541
SAINT ANDREWS 11	1,726
SAINT ANDREWS 12	2,272
SAINT ANDREWS 13	1,983
SAINT ANDREWS 14	2,108
SAINT ANDREWS 1	1,141
SAINT ANDREWS 20	2,929
SAINT ANDREWS 21	1,849
SAINT ANDREWS 22	1,417
SAINT ANDREWS 2	1,745
SAINT ANDREWS 30	1,032

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 42

Area	Population
SAINT ANDREWS 3	1,132
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,081
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.946

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area	Population
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CHARLESTON 11	564
CHARLESTON 12	734
CHARLESTON 13	1,116
CHARLESTON 14	881
CHARLESTON 15	722
CHARLESTON 1	1,128
CHARLESTON 22	730
CHARLESTON 23	1,296
CHARLESTON 24	879
CHARLESTON 2	1,203
CHARLESTON 3	2,610
CHARLESTON 4	478
CHARLESTON 5	3,076
CHARLESTON 6	1,471
CHARLESTON 7	789
DEER PARK 1	3,600
DEER PARK 3	2,300
JAMES ISLAND 11	1,898
JAMES ISLAND 12	1,586
JAMES ISLAND 17	950

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area	Population
JAMES ISLAND 1	1,323
JAMES ISLAND 3	1,428
JAMES ISLAND 6	1,243
JAMES ISLAND 7	859
JAMES ISLAND 8	1,289
JOHNS ISLAND 1	3,057
JOHNS ISLAND 2	1,557
JOHNS ISLAND 3	3,004
JOHNS ISLAND 4	1,157
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 10	24
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 11	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 12	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 13	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 14	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 15	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 16	2
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 17	110
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 18	56
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 19	256
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 1	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 20	33
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 2	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 3	5,694
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 4	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 5	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 6	4
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 7	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 8	0
NAVAL SHIPYARD NO. 9	92
NORTH CHARLESTON 15	1,949
NORTH CHARLESTON 16	1,300
NORTH CHARLESTON 17	1,886

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 43

Area	Population
NORTH CHARLESTON 18	
Tract 0036.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417	1,258
NORTH CHARLESTON 19	1,479
NORTH CHARLESTON 23	
Tract 0035.00	
Blocks: 417, 418, 419, 420, 501, 502, 503	291
NORTH CHARLESTON 24	1,282
NORTH CHARLESTON 25	1,168
NORTH CHARLESTON 26	1,750
NORTH CHARLESTON 27	623
NORTH CHARLESTON 29	1,155
NORTH CHARLESTON 30	2,190
NORTH CHARLESTON 31	2,195
NORTH CHARLESTON 32	3,632
NORTH CHARLESTON 33	4,531
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,888
PERCENT VARIATION	0.119

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area	Population
Berkeley County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CAINHOY	
Tract 0204.02	
Blocks: 279, 284, 285	0

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area **Population**

GOOSE CREEK 2

Tract 0208.01

Blocks: 601, 602, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632A, 632B, 633A, 633B, 634 6,493

Tract 0208.02

Blocks: 115, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 208 315

HANAHAN

Tract 0209.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 201, 202, 203, 204, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218, 219, 220, 301, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 321, 322, 325, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717 8,240

Tract 0210.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 208, 209, 210A, 210B, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 801, 802A, 802B, 803, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918 . . . 4,856

Charleston County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CHRIST CHURCH 1 1,888

CHRIST CHURCH 2 2,180

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area	Population
CHRIST CHURCH 3	1,027
CHRIST CHURCH 6	468
CHRIST CHURCH 7	1,637
CHRIST CHURCH 8	7,248
CHRIST CHURCH 9	2,998
DEER PARK 2	5,771
FOLLY BEACH	1,255
ISLE OF PALMS 1	929
ISLE OF PALMS 2	2,751
JAMES ISLAND 2	0
JAMES ISLAND 4	809
JAMES ISLAND 5	2,527
JOHNS ISLAND 5	1,631
MOUNT PLEASANT 10	1,110
MOUNT PLEASANT 11	1,175
MOUNT PLEASANT 1	824
MOUNT PLEASANT 2	1,790
MOUNT PLEASANT 3	1,308
MOUNT PLEASANT 4	1,054
MOUNT PLEASANT 5	1,637
MOUNT PLEASANT 6	1,905
MOUNT PLEASANT 7	1,254
MOUNT PLEASANT 8	1,334
MOUNT PLEASANT 9	3,345
NORTH CHARLESTON 20	1,564
NORTH CHARLESTON 21	727
NORTH CHARLESTON 22	681
NORTH CHARLESTON 23	
Tract 0035.00	
Blocks: 309, 314, 315, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 415, 416, 504, 505, 511, 517	904

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 44

Area	**Population**
SULLIVANS ISLAND	1,623
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,258
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.712

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	**Population**
Beaufort County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DALE LOBECO	1,244
LADYS ISLAND 3A	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 553, 554, 555, 556, 558, 559, 564, 566, 567, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 596, 597	1,141
SAINT HELENA 1A	1,568
SAINT HELENA 1B	1,689
SAINT HELENA 2A	524
SAINT HELENA 2B	1,687
SAINT HELENA 2C	1,111
SHELDON 1	1,052
SHELDON 2	898

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	Population
Charleston County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ADAMS RUN 2	1,149
EDISTO	1,318
HOLLYWOOD	2,198
MEGGETT 1	2,340
MEGGETT 2	969
no name for (0190154)	1,764
RAVENEL 1	1,738
RAVENEL 2	1,210
SAINT ANDREWS 24	2,118
SAINT ANDREWS 25	1,031
WADMALAW 1	1,266
WADMALAW 2	1,304
Colleton County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ASHTON	170
BELLS	373
BEREA	138
EDISTO BEACH	351
EDISTO	524
GREEN POND	1,380
HENDERSONVILLE	1,921
HUDSON'S MILL	544
JACKSONBORO	631
LODGE	679
MASHAWVILLE	1,015
PENIEL	609
PETITS	194
RICE PATCH	971
RITTER	1,489

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 45

Area	Population
RUFFIN	506
SMOAKS	1,332
SNIDERS	873
STOKES	710
WALTERBORO 1	2,694
WALTERBORO 2	3,303
WALTERBORO 3	2,898
WILLIAMS	516
Dorchester County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
DELEMARS	505
GIVHANS	1,688
SAUL DAM	269
Hampton County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BLACK CREEK	256
BONNETT	758
CUMMINGS	1,137
EARLY BRANCH	523
FURMAN	528
HOPEWELL	209
HORSE GALL	99
YEMASEE	1,218
Jasper County	15,487
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,817
PERCENT VARIATION	0.025

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	Population
Beaufort County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
AS 10	0
AS 11	0
AS 12	0
AS 1	0
AS 2	0
AS 3	760
AS 4	0
AS 5	0
AS 6	0
AS 7	0
AS 8	0
AS 9	0
BEAUFORT 1A	545
BEAUFORT 1B	1,108
BEAUFORT 2	1,381
BEAUFORT 3	1,798
BLUFFTON 1	2,348
BLUFFTON 2	3,784
BURTON 1A	1,846
BURTON 1B	3,316
BURTON 2A	1,815
BURTON 2B	2,047
BURTON 2C	1,500
BURTON 3	1,774
CHECHESSEE	660
DAUFUSKIE	122
HILTON HEAD 10	223
HILTON HEAD 11	2,165
HILTON HEAD 12	1,184
HILTON HEAD 13	1,696

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	Population
HILTON HEAD 14	1,317
HILTON HEAD 15A	938
HILTON HEAD 15B	571
HILTON HEAD 1	1,990
HILTON HEAD 2	2,074
HILTON HEAD 3	730
HILTON HEAD 4A	927
HILTON HEAD 4B	1,921
HILTON HEAD 5A	1,032
HILTON HEAD 5B	888
HILTON HEAD 6A	676
HILTON HEAD 6B	1,207
HILTON HEAD 7	1,633
HILTON HEAD 8	1,785
HILTON HEAD 9	1,025
LADYS ISLAND 1A	1,451
LADYS ISLAND 1B	968
LADYS ISLAND 2A	1,032
LADYS ISLAND 3A	
Tract 0009.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325	454
LB 10	55
LB 1	301
LB 2	319
LB 3	273
LB 4	5
LB 5	14
LB 6	1,096
LB 7	489
LB 8	922

SC SENATE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 46

Area	Population
LB 9	604
MOSSY OAKS 1A	1,641
MOSSY OAKS 1B	960
MOSSY OAKS 2	1,888
PI 10	0
PI 1	0
PI 2	1,278
PI 3	1,030
PI 4	535
PI 5	255
PI 6	1,256
PI 7	387
PI 8	701
PI 9	1,730
PORT ROYAL 1	1,357
PORT ROYAL 2	1,609
SEABROOK 1	1,681
SEABROOK 2	915
SEABROOK 3	1,519
DISTRICT TOTAL	75,511
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.379

D-1

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

Population Summary Report

Dist.	Total	Black	Pct. Black	Total18+	Black18+	Pct. Black18+	Pct. Dev.
1	27,914	1,119	4.01	21,205	821	3.87	-0.73
2	27,908	3,932	14.09	21,039	2,680	12.74	-0.75
3	27,863	2,763	9.92	23,883	2,200	9.21	-0.91
4	28,114	1,360	4.84	20,978	975	4.65	-0.02
5	27,903	2,414	8.65	20,979	1,718	8.19	-0.77
6	28,166	6,409	22.75	21,456	4,359	20.32	0.17
7	28,053	5,149	18.35	21,099	3,644	17.27	-0.23
8	28,014	2,937	10.48	21,061	1,998	9.49	-0.37
9	27,844	6,912	24.82	21,047	4,503	21.39	-0.98
10	28,120	2,022	7.19	20,753	1,419	6.84	0.00
11	28,072	7,857	27.99	20,754	5,367	25.86	-0.17
12	27,967	9,661	34.54	20,892	6,805	32.57	-0.54
13	28,331	9,587	33.84	21,337	6,356	29.79	0.75
14	27,840	7,145	25.66	20,621	4,846	23.50	-0.99
15	27,926	7,953	28.48	21,567	5,737	26.60	-0.69
16	28,331	8,618	30.42	20,775	5,931	28.55	0.75
17	27,871	1,598	5.73	20,800	1,186	5.70	-0.88
18	27,937	5,486	19.64	20,931	3,621	17.30	-0.65
19	28,193	2,037	7.23	22,078	1,297	5.87	0.26
20	27,849	2,086	7.49	20,964	1,428	6.81	-0.96
21	27,883	1,213	4.35	20,403	876	4.29	-0.84
22	27,910	2,414	8.65	23,199	1,680	7.24	-0.74
23	28,036	17,592	62.75	20,774	12,036	57.94	-0.30
24	27,881	2,687	9.64	21,582	1,816	8.41	-0.85
25	28,286	16,338	57.76	20,360	10,944	53.75	0.59
26	28,299	2,947	10.41	21,063	1,967	9.34	0.64
27	27,923	3,173	11.36	20,008	2,161	10.80	-0.70
28	27,913	2,740	9.82	20,694	1,857	8.97	-0.73
29	27,853	5,116	18.37	20,338	3,526	17.34	-0.95
30	27,959	7,481	26.76	20,613	4,789	23.23	-0.57
31	27,866	18,872	67.72	20,342	12,599	61.94	-0.90
32	27,870	2,950	10.58	21,674	1,946	8.98	-0.89
33	27,851	3,224	11.58	20,992	2,216	10.56	-0.95
34	27,876	4,936	17.71	21,056	3,290	15.63	-0.86
35	27,950	3,834	13.72	20,720	2,639	12.74	-0.60
36	27,941	3,263	11.68	21,144	2,277	10.77	-0.63
37	28,138	4,268	15.17	21,537	3,082	14.31	0.07
38	27,856	2,745	9.85	20,669	1,858	8.99	-0.94
39	28,040	8,391	29.93	20,563	5,449	26.50	-0.28
40	28,231	10,247	36.30	21,014	6,906	32.86	0.40
41	28,343	15,822	55.82	20,203	10,401	51.48	0.80
42	28,368	8,451	29.79	21,313	5,725	26.86	0.89
43	28,374	8,252	29.08	20,447	5,358	26.20	0.91
44	28,236	6,846	24.25	20,716	4,484	21.65	0.42
45	28,372	7,618	26.85	20,666	4,884	23.63	0.90
46	28,243	2,696	9.55	21,738	1,757	8.08	0.44
47	27,933	4,056	14.52	20,138	2,745	13.63	-0.66
48	28,342	1,562	5.51	21,759	1,086	4.99	0.79
49	27,863	15,958	57.27	19,977	10,794	54.03	-0.91
50	28,019	16,863	60.18	19,268	10,769	55.89	-0.36

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

Population Summary Report

Dist.	Total	Black	Pct. Black	Total18+	Black18+	Pct. Black18+	Pct. Dev.
51	28,316	18,450	65.16	19,916	12,367	62.10	0.70
52	28,295	9,109	32.19	20,867	6,313	30.25	0.63
53	28,046	9,690	34.55	20,462	6,483	31.68	-0.26
54	28,303	13,941	49.26	20,074	9,193	45.80	0.65
55	27,951	11,769	42.11	19,196	7,133	37.16	-0.60
56	28,302	9,379	33.14	20,454	6,069	29.67	0.65
57	27,937	16,101	57.63	19,108	10,127	53.00	-0.65
58	28,290	8,031	28.39	20,173	5,092	25.24	0.61
59	28,216	15,996	56.69	19,916	10,513	52.79	0.34
60	27,959	9,406	33.64	19,400	5,875	30.28	-0.57
61	28,180	10,838	38.46	19,725	6,692	33.93	0.22
62	28,395	17,997	63.38	20,089	11,997	59.72	0.98
63	28,379	3,797	13.38	21,611	2,383	11.03	0.92
64	27,868	15,468	55.50	19,593	10,075	51.42	-0.89
65	28,351	9,533	33.62	20,398	6,134	30.07	0.83
66	28,176	18,267	64.83	19,626	11,805	60.15	0.20
67	28,027	7,757	27.68	20,976	5,412	25.80	-0.33
68	28,114	8,948	31.83	19,590	5,739	29.30	-0.02
69	27,895	2,420	8.68	20,845	1,683	8.07	-0.80
70	27,867	16,926	60.74	20,518	11,847	57.74	-0.90
71	27,894	5,549	19.89	20,746	3,893	18.77	-0.80
72	27,915	10,299	36.89	24,187	7,858	32.49	-0.73
73	27,862	19,683	70.64	20,824	14,063	67.53	-0.91
74	27,919	20,212	72.40	20,591	13,756	66.81	-0.71
75	27,878	8,875	31.84	23,037	6,479	28.12	-0.86
76	27,842	2,946	10.58	22,985	2,374	10.33	-0.99
77	27,889	18,356	65.82	20,331	12,628	62.11	-0.82
78	27,881	7,435	26.67	20,365	4,714	23.15	-0.85
79	27,898	4,235	15.18	19,372	2,740	14.14	-0.79
80	27,903	11,857	42.49	19,004	7,312	38.48	-0.77
81	28,074	8,008	28.52	21,061	5,407	25.67	-0.16
82	28,043	11,282	40.23	19,973	7,458	37.34	-0.27
83	28,129	5,508	19.58	20,524	3,551	17.30	0.04
84	28,170	5,941	21.09	20,360	3,829	18.81	0.18
85	28,183	1,738	6.17	20,060	1,157	5.77	0.23
86	28,076	7,662	27.29	19,931	5,094	25.56	-0.15
87	28,327	1,914	6.76	20,560	1,341	6.52	0.74
88	27,894	2,592	9.29	19,751	1,590	8.05	-0.80
89	28,358	4,841	17.07	22,404	3,208	14.32	0.85
90	28,377	14,987	52.81	20,116	9,971	49.57	0.92
91	28,307	13,582	47.98	19,942	8,784	44.05	0.67
92	28,365	2,385	8.41	18,684	1,424	7.62	0.87
93	28,164	14,939	53.04	20,129	9,913	49.25	0.16
94	28,244	4,111	14.56	19,596	2,615	13.34	0.44
95	28,313	18,100	63.93	21,283	13,304	62.51	0.69
96	28,269	7,197	25.46	20,073	4,724	23.53	0.53
97	28,225	12,547	44.45	20,262	8,722	43.05	0.38
98	28,212	3,054	10.83	19,763	1,958	9.91	0.33
99	28,221	3,517	12.46	19,931	2,285	11.46	0.36
100	28,264	6,639	23.49	18,493	4,124	22.30	0.52

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

Population Summary Report

Dist.	Total	Black	Pct. Black	Total18+	Black18+	Pct. Black18+	Pct. Dev.
101	28,211	18,320	64.94	18,902	11,425	60.44	0.33
102	28,392	16,143	56.86	19,392	10,374	53.50	0.97
103	28,315	15,499	54.74	18,991	9,497	50.01	0.70
104	28,332	7,660	27.04	21,645	4,782	22.09	0.76
105	28,254	4,702	16.64	20,858	3,000	14.38	0.48
106	28,344	1,255	4.43	22,701	839	3.70	0.80
107	27,940	2,171	7.77	22,359	1,459	6.53	-0.64
108	27,975	10,191	36.43	20,394	6,361	31.19	-0.51
109	28,312	14,779	52.20	21,331	10,066	47.19	0.69
110	28,376	14,361	50.61	22,629	9,999	44.19	0.91
111	28,396	18,805	66.22	21,336	12,918	60.55	0.99
112	28,265	1,331	4.71	21,590	874	4.05	0.52
113	28,227	5,976	21.17	20,038	3,675	18.34	0.38
114	28,309	3,969	14.02	21,778	2,690	12.35	0.68
115	28,160	6,262	22.24	21,217	4,186	19.73	0.15
116	28,371	16,651	58.69	19,929	11,034	55.37	0.90
117	28,387	4,764	16.78	20,137	2,826	14.03	0.95
118	28,323	12,065	42.60	20,129	7,302	36.28	0.73
119	28,384	7,129	25.12	22,489	4,810	21.39	0.94
120	28,374	15,658	55.18	19,407	9,793	50.46	0.91
121	28,279	10,793	38.17	19,588	6,806	34.75	0.57
122	28,376	14,905	52.53	18,619	9,283	49.86	0.91
123	28,398	3,015	10.62	22,995	1,952	8.49	0.99
124	28,169	10,066	35.73	21,978	7,073	32.18	0.18

3,486,703	1039884		2566496	691,040	-0.19

Mean Deviation is: 176
Mean Percent Deviation is: 0.63

Largest Positive Deviation is:	279	0.99 Percent
Largest Negative Deviation is:	-279	-0.99 Percent
Overall Range in Deviation is:	558	1.98 Percent

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 1

Area	**Population**
Oconee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
HOLLY SPRINGS	683
KEOWEE KEY	1,418
LONG CREEK	447
MADISON	869
MOUNTAIN REST	1,078
OAKWAY	
Tract 0309.00	
Blocks: 205, 206, 209, 210, 211, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219, 251, 257, 258	424
RICHLAND	893
SALEM	2,394
SOUTH UNION	903
TAMASEE	1,436
WALHALLA	9,699
WESTMINSTER	7,670
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,914
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.726

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 2

Area	**Population**
Oconee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
FRIENDSHIP	2,319
KEOWEE	2,527
NEWRY CORINTH	530

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 2

Area	**Population**
OAKWAY	
Tract 0309.00	
Blocks: 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 137, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 213, 214, 215, 259, 260, 261	626
PROVIDENCE	
Tract 0309.00	
Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 570	637
RAVENEL	2,098
RETURN	643
SENECA	13,965
SHILOH	1,296
TOKEENA	629
UTICA	1,008
WEST UNION	1,630
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,908
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.747

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area	**Population**
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CALHOUN	3,672
CENTRAL 1	2,483

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area **Population**

CENTRAL 2

Tract 0110.03

Blocks: 251, 252 3

Tract 0111.01

Blocks: 101, 102, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116A, 116B, 116C, 153, 154, 155, 156, 160A, 160B, 161A, 161B, 162 166

Tract 0111.02

Blocks: 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112A, 112B, 113A, 113B, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 201A, 201B, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212A, 212B, 213A, 213B, 214, 215A, 215B, 215C, 215D, 216A, 216B, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223A, 223B, 224A, 224B, 224C, 225A, 225B, 226 1,560

Tract 0111.03

Blocks: 145, 148, 149, 150, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177 81

CLEMSON 2,554

LAWRENCE CHAPEL 719

PIKE 755

PRATERS CREEK

Tract 0103.00

Blocks: 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 253, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266 636

SIX MILE 3,368

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 3

Area	**Population**
STONE CHURCH	2,626
UNIVERSITY	9,240
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,863
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.907

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area	**Population**
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ALBERT R. LEWIS	2,027
AMBLER	1,493
CENTRAL 2	
Tract 0111.02	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104	86
Tract 0111.03	
Blocks: 143B, 151B, 153B, 154, 155, 156C, 159B, 159C	162
DACUSVILLE	
Tract 0105.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 136, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 153, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 228, 242, 243	1,580
HOLLY SPRINGS	1,437
LIBERTY 1	3,428

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 4

Area	Population
LIBERTY 2	1,398
MOUNTAIN VIEW	1,218
NORRIS	1,994
PICKENS 1	3,617
PICKENS 2	2,588
PICKENS 3	3,675
PRATERS CREEK	
Tract 0102.00	
Blocks: 186, 194	28
Tract 0103.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153	601
PUMPKINTOWN	1,492
RICES CREEK	1,290
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,111
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.014

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	Population
Pickens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ARIAL MILL	3,052
BRUSHY CREEK	1,699
CEDAR ROCK	990
EASLEY	3,687

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 5

Area	**Population**
FLAT ROCK	1,964
FOREST ACRES	4,034
MCKISSICK	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 107, 132, 167, 168, 210, 211, 212	237
Tract 0108.01	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 102, 103A, 103B, 103C, 104A, 104B, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112A, 112E, 112C, 112D, 113A, 113B, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131, 132A, 132B, 135, 136A, 136B, 137A, 137B, 138, 142, 143, 144, 151	1,493
Tract 0108.02	
Blocks: 101A, 101B, 102A, 102B, 103, 104A, 104B, 105A, 105B, 106A, 106B, 106C, 106D, 107, 120, 123, 124, 125A, 125B, 152, 153, 154	349
PARK STREET	5,011
SMITH GROVE	2,202
ZION	3,185
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,903
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.765

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 6

Area	**Population**
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
APPLETON EQUINOX	2,142

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 6

Area	**Population**
DENVER SANDY SPRINGS	
Tract 0106.00	
Blocks: 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 427, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439	365
Tract 0108.00	
Blocks: 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 224	141
EDGEWOOD	3,626
FIVE FORKS	1,346
HOPEWELL	2,518
LA FRANCE	630
MELTON	562
MOUNT TABOR	1,723
PENDLETON	4,112
PIERCETOWN	716
WARD 1 PRECINCT 1	2,559
WARD 5 PRECINCT 1	1,150
WARD 5 PRECINCT 2	2,503
WARD 6 PRECINCT 1	2,767
WARD 6 PRECINCT 2	1,306
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,166
PERCENT VARIATION	0.171

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area	**Population**
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BAKERS CREEK	306

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area	Population
BELTON	6,460
BROADVIEW	823
BROADWAY	
Tract 0004.00	
Blocks: 101, 124, 125, 126	20
Tract 0005.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 206B, 207	330
Tract 0112.00	
Blocks: 223, 224, 225	188
Tract 0113.00	
Blocks: 105, 106, 107, 108A, 108B, 123A, 123B, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230	1,581
Tract 0114.00	
Blocks: 501A, 501B, 502, 503	80
CHIQUOLA MILL	1,216
CRAYTONVILLE	1,246
FRIENDSHIP	1,156
HALL	2,125
HIGH POINT	745
HONEA PATH	2,424
IVA	2,468
JACKSON MILL	1,285
MCADAMS	228

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 7

Area	**Population**
NEALS CREEK	
Tract 0113.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 316, 317, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 407, 408, 409, 410, 412, 413	1,931
ROCK SPRING	988
SHIRLEYS STORE	905
TONEY CREEK	617
WRIGHTS SCHOOL	931
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,053
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.231

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 8

Area	**Population**
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CENTERVILLE	5,348

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 8

Area **Population**

DENVER SANDY SPRINGS

Tract 0106.00

Blocks: 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 428, 429, 430, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450 953

Tract 0108.00

Blocks: 222, 227, 228, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321 595

FORK 1 816

FORK 2 1,292

GREEN POND 3,989

HOMELAND PARK

Tract 0118.00

Blocks: 103, 104 99

Tract 0119.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 331, 332, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417 3,755

LAKESIDE 3,433

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 8

Area	**Population**
MOUNTAIN CREEK	
Tract 0120.00	
Blocks: 420, 421, 422, 423	104
ORR MILL	
Tract 0006.00	
Blocks: 401B, 402, 403, 404B, 405B, 406B, 407, 408A, 408B, 409, 414, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420B, 421, 422, 423	524
ROCK MILL	2,059
TOWNVILLE	555
VARENNES	2,820
Oconee County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
EARLES GROVE	889
FAIR PLAY	723
PROVIDENCE	
Tract 0309.00	
Blocks: 541, 542, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569	60
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,014
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.370

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area	**Population**
Anderson County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BOWLING GREEN	727

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area **Population**

BROADWAY

Tract 0004.00

Blocks: 102, 108, 109, 110, IIIB, 117C, 121C, 121D, 122B, 123B 116

Tract 0005.00

Blocks: 204B, 205B, 208C, 208D 13

Tract 0112.00

Blocks: 202, 203 157

CEDAR GROVE 1,378

HAMMOND SCHOOL 2,726

NEALS CREEK

Tract 0004.00

Blocks: 129B, 202B 0

Tract 0005.00

Blocks: 109, 110, 114, 120B, 122B, 127, 134B, 135, 136B, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316 1,192

Tract 0006.00

Blocks: 201B, 202B, 203, 204B, 206C, 210B, 214, 226B, 227B, 230, 231, 338 56

ORR MILL

Tract 0006.00

Blocks: 410, 411B, 412B, 413, 415, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429 211

Tract 0007.00

Blocks: 247A, 288A, 288C, 290, 293A, 293C, 294, 295, 296, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418D, 419D, 419E, 419F, 602B, 603B, 603C, 604A, 605, 606, 607, 608A, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614A, 614B, 614C, 615, 616B, 617, 618, 619, 620B, 621, 622,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area	Population
623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653	1,619
WARD 1 PRECINCT 2	1,708
WARD 2 PRECINCT 1	1,971
WARD 2 PRECINCT 2	3,647
WARD 3 PRECINCT 1	2,283
WARD 3 PRECINCT 2	2,366
WARD 4 PRECINCT 1	2,089
WARD 4 PRECINCT 2	1,834
WILLIAMSTON MILL	
Tract 0104.01	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105A, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126A, 129A, 130A, 131A, 132, 133, 134, 135A, 136, 137A, 138A, 143, 144, 145, 601A, 601B, 602A, 602B, 603, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 628, 629, 630, 631, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638A, 638B, 639, 640, 641A, 641B, 642, 643A, 643B, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652	1,509
Tract 0104.02	
Blocks: 305, 306, 307A, 307B, 308, 309A, 310A, 313, 314, 315, 336, 337, 338	300
WILLIAMSTON	
Tract 0104.01	
Blocks: 105B, 106, 126B, 126C, 127, 128, 129B, 140, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222D, 223	473

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 9

Area **Population**

Tract 0104.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160 1,469

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,844

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.974

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 10

Area **Population**

Anderson County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BISHOPS BRANCH 1,413
BRUSHY CREEK 3,706
CONCRETE 4,660
PELZER 1,537
PIEDMONT 1,201
SIMPSONVILLE 2,285
THREE AND TWENTY 3,981
WALKER-MCELMOYLE 963
WEST PELZER 2,625
WHITE PLAINS 2,612

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 10

Area **Population**

WILLIAMSTON MILL

Tract 0104.01

Blocks: 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 627, 632, 653, 654 132

WILLIAMSTON

Tract 0103.00

Blocks: 122, 129, 130, 131 153

Tract 0104.01

Blocks: 201A, 201B, 202A, 202B, 203A, 203B, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212A, 212B, 213A, 213B, 214, 215A, 215B, 222A, 222B, 222C, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239A, 239B, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248A, 248B, 249, 250, 251, 309A, 311, 322, 323, 324A, 325, 401A, 401B, 402, 403, 404A, 404B, 405, 406, 407A, 407B, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 513, 514A, 514B, 514C, 515A, 515B, 516A, 516B, 516C, 517A, 517B, 518A, 518B, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529A, 529B, 530, 531A, 531B, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553A, 553B, 554, 555A, 555B, 556A, 556B, 557A, 557B, 558, 559, 560 2,822

Tract 0104.02

Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326 30

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 10

Area	Population
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,120
PERCENT VARIATION	0.007

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 11

Area	Population
Abbeville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
ABBEVILLE 1	2,866
ABBEVILLE 2	2,762
ABBEVILLE 3	1,487
ABBEVILLE 4	1,403
ABBEVILLE MILL	776
ANTREVILLE	1,362
CALHOUN FALLS 1	1,932
CALHOUN FALLS 2	1,151
CENTRAL	269
COLD SPRINGS	988
DUE WEST	2,032
HAMPTON	37
HILLVILLE	361
KEOWEE	555
LEBANON	658
LEVEL LAND	432
LOWNDESVILLE 1	484
LOWNDESVILLE 2	336
MOUNTAIN VIEW	457
ROCK SPRINGS	708
WATTS	345

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 11

Area **Population**

Anderson County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

CORNER 335
FLATROCK 2,066
GLUCK MILL 469
GROVE SCHOOL 301
HOMELAND PARK
Tract 0118.00
Blocks: 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123, 138 513
MOUNTAIN CREEK
Tract 0119.00
Blocks: 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613 40
Tract 0120.00
Blocks: 426, 427, 428, 430 26
Tract 0122.00
Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 329, 332, 335, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354 1,575
STARR 910
WEST SAVANNAH 436

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,072

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.164

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 12

Area **Population**

Greenwood County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BRADLEY 238
CALLISON 328
CAMBRIDGE 325
EPWORTH 389
GLENDALE 3,637
GREENWOOD MILL
Tract 9704.00
Blocks: 403A, 405A, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 434, 435, 436, 501A, 505A, 506 268
GREENWOOD NO 5
Tract 9704.00
Blocks: 309A, 309B, 331, 332, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 433, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456A, 457, 458, 459, 460A, 460B, 460C, 462, 465A, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 512A, 513, 533A, 533B, 535A, 536A, 538 418
HARRIS
Tract 9703.00
Blocks: 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 249, 250, 251 651
Tract 9704.00
Blocks: 402, 403B 3
KIRKSEY'S 393
LACO 2,691

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 12

Area	**Population**
NEW MARKET	
Tract 9706.00	
Blocks: 401, 410B, 411B, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 501, 502B, 516B, 517B, 520B, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541	1,383
Tract 9708.00	
Blocks: 230	0
NINETY SIX	3,279
NINETY SIX MILL	1,661
OAK GROVE	223
PHOENIX	625
TROY	262
VERDERY	968
McCormick County	8,868
Saluda County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CENTENNIAL	716
MAYSON	571
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,967
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.537

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 13

Area **Population**

Greenwood County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BLAKEDALE 3,091

FAIRGROUND

Tract 9702.00

Blocks: 205, 207, 237B, 239, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309B, 310, 311, 312, 403B, 403C, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 502B, 504B, 615B 2,490

Tract 9705.00

Blocks: 101, 102B, 103, 104, 105B, 106, 107, 108, 109B, 109C, 110B, 124, 128B, 129B 311

Tract 9706.00

Blocks: 204, 205, 206, 207, 208 64

GREENWOOD MILL

Tract 9704.00

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 401A, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 431 945

GREENWOOD NO 1 3,882

GREENWOOD NO 2 3,461

GREENWOOD NO 3 3,312

GREENWOOD NO 4

Tract 9702.00

Blocks: 237A, 309A, 403A, 413, 414, 415, 416A, 416B, 417, 418, 419, 420, 502A, 503, 504A, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 601, 602,

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 13

Area	Population
603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615A, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622	3,429
Tract 9705.00	
Blocks: 102A, 105A, 109A, 110A, 111, 112, 113, 115, 122, 125, 126, 127, 128A, 129A, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134	924
GREENWOOD NO 5	
Tract 9704.00	
Blocks: 124, 131, 132, 133, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330	1,422
GREENWOOD NO 6	2,976
HARRIS	
Tract 9703.00	
Blocks: 201, 202, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 230, 236, 237, 238, 240, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 505B, 516B, 518B, 519, 520B, 522, 536B	2,024
Tract 9704.00	
Blocks: 401B, 404	0
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,331
PERCENT VARIATION	0.758

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 14

Area **Population**

Abbeville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BROADMOUTH 505
DONALDS 717
HALLS STORE 1,239

Greenwood County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

COKESBURY 1,442
CORONACA 1,315
EMERALD 2,892
FAIRGROUND
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 130, 131, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218B, 218C, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224B, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 401, 402, 416C, 501B 816
Tract 9706.00
Blocks: 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 201, 202, 203 891
Tract 9707.00
Blocks: 113 1
GREENWOOD NO 4
Tract 9702.00
Blocks: 218A, 224A, 501A 6
HODGES 1,761
NEW MARKET
Tract 9707.00
Blocks: 126, 127 276
RILEY 394

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 14

Area	Population
SHOALS JUNCTION	351
STONEY POINT	600
WARE SHOALS	2,679
Laurens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BAILEYS	
Tract 9803.00	
Blocks: 301, 302, 303, 304, 319, 320, 321, 322, 411, 419, 420, 421, 422, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433	502
Tract 9807.00	
Blocks: 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 530, 531	144
BREWERTON	737
CROSS HILL	1,656
DANIELS STORE	145
EKOM	296
HICKORY TAVERN	1,509
MADDENS	1,563
MOUNT OLIVE	411
MOUNT PLEASANT	283
MOUNTVILLE	889
POPLAR SPRINGS	689
PRINCETON	528
TIP TOP	1,194
WATERLOO	1,409
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,840
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.989

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area	Population
Laurens County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CLINTON 1 BOX 1	2,534
CLINTON 1 BOX 2	6,527
CLINTON MILL	3,470
HOPEWELL	496
JOANNA	1,979
LYDIA MILL	1,969
RENNO	323
SHADY GROVE	508
Newberry County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
BETH EDEN	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134	266
MAYBINTON	152
MOUNT BETHEL GARMANY	
Tract 9502.00	
Blocks: 110, 111, 112, 117, 119, 120	60
MOUNT PLEASANT	1,380
WHITMIRE CITY	1,702
WHITMIRE OUTSIDE	1,381
Spartanburg County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
CROSS ANCHOR	969

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 15

Area **Population**

PAULINE GLENN SPRINGS

Tract 0238.00

Blocks: 236, 237, 238, 239, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285 456

WALNUT GROVE

Tract 0238.00

Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 587 1,785

Union County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BLACK ROCK 626

CROSS KEYS 1,224

PUTMAN

Tract 0307.00

Blocks: 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 224, 225 119

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,926

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.683

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 16

Area **Population**

Laurens County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BAILEYS

Tract 9803.00

Blocks: 101B, 102, 120B, 120C, 125C, 126B, 128, 129C, 130B, 133B, 134B, 135, 136B, 137B, 138B, 139B, 140, 201B, 207B, 212B, 213, 216, 217, 218, 219, 305, 306, 401, 402, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 423 1,101

Tract 9804.00

Blocks: 724B 0

Tract 9807.00

Blocks: 502, 503 0

BARKSDALE NARNI 1,003

COOKS STORE 684

DIALS 405

GRAY COURT 1,531

GRAYS 492

JONES STORE 1,607

LANFORD 553

LONG BRANCH 1,633

ORA 436

OWINGS 972

PLEASANT MOUND 442

SHILOH 286

STEWART STORE 764

TRINITY RIDGE 1,473

WARD 1 537

WARD 2 1,044

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 16

Area	Population
WARD 3	1,344
WARD 4	2,496
WARD 5	2,454
WARD 6	2,034
WATTSVILLE	2,734
WOODVILLE	1,483
YOUNGS	841
DISTRICT TOTAL	28,331
PERCENT VARIATION	0.758

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 17

Area	Population
Greenville County	
Census Voting Tabulation Districts	
EBENEZER	1,827
GOWENSVILLE	1,736
JENNINGS MILL	996
MARIDELL	2,795
MOUNTAIN VIEW	2,029
SANDY FLAT	
Tract 0026.01	
Blocks: 201, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 223, 229, 230, 260	1,211

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 17

Area **Population**

Tract 0039.02

Blocks: 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 147, 150, 151, 152, 157, 158, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 255, 256 945

SKYLAND 2,753

SLATER MARIETTA 5,725

TIGERVILLE 1,934

TRAVELERS REST 3,074

TUBBS MOUNTAIN 2,846

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,871

PERCENT VARIATION .... -0.878

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

DEL NORTE

Tract 0026.04

Blocks: 520, 521, 522 194

FAIRVIEW 3,518

FROHAWK 2,931

GREER 1 1,440

GREER 2 1,340

GREER 3 1,543

GREER 4 2,344

ONEAL 3,081

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area **Population**

PLEASANT GROVE

Tract 0025.03

Blocks: 112, 113B, 116B, 118, 119A, 119B, 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206B, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331 . . . 1,689

Tract 0025.05

Blocks: 507C, 802B, 802C, 804, 805B 0

SANDY FLAT

Tract 0026.01

Blocks: 210, 211, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 231, 232, 233, 235, 238, 242, 244, 249, 250, 251, 252. 1,327

TAYLORS

Tract 0026.04

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514 2,730

Spartanburg County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

DUNCAN

Tract 0232.00

Blocks: 203, 206, 208, 209, 213, 226, 227 . . . 370

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 18

Area	Population
EAST GREER	1,511
VICTOR MILL	
Tract 0232.00	
Blocks: 401, 402A, 402B, 410, 413A, 413B, 417, 418, 419, 420A, 420B, 424, 436	308
Tract 0233.00	
Blocks: 315, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322A, 323, 324, 401A, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418A, 418B, 419, 501A, 501B, 501C, 502A, 502B, 503A, 503B, 503C, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510A, 510B, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515A, 515B, 516, 517A, 517B, 517C, 518A, 518B, 518C, 518D, 518E, 518F, 519, 520, 521A, 521B, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 595, 596, 597, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806A, 806B, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815	3,611
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,937
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.644

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 19

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

ARMSTRONG 1,542
BEREA 2,984
FURMAN 5,028
LEAWOOD
Tract 0038.02
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 301, 305 2,131
MONAVIEW
Tract 0022.01
Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 202, 203, 204, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832 2,599
Tract 0023.02
Blocks: 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 732, 733, 803, 804, 807, 901, 902, 903 1,269
Tract 0037.02
Blocks: 306 87
Tract 0037.04
Blocks: 301, 319, 320 97
PARIS MOUNTAIN 1,368

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 19

Area **Population**

PARK PLACE
Tract 0023.02
Blocks: 401, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 601, 602, 603, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 634, 701, 728, 729, 730, 801, 802 1,808
Tract 0023.03
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411 339
POINSETT 2,850
SALUDA 1,885
SULPHUR SPRINGS 2,506
UNION BLEACHERY 1,052
WASHINGTON HEIGHTS
Tract 0023.04
Blocks: 202, 210, 211, 212, 213, 220, 221, 222, 310 648

DISTRICT TOTAL 28,193

PERCENT VARIATION 0.267

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area **Population**

Greenville County
Census Voting Tabulation Districts
AVON 2,312
BROOKGLENN 3,756

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 20

Area	Population
DEL NORTE	
Tract 0026.04	
Blocks: 515, 516, 517, 518, 519	648
EDWARDS FOREST	2,467
GREENVILLE 1	1,168
LEAWOOD	
Tract 0023.04	
Blocks: 303, 305	69
Tract 0038.02	
Blocks: 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319	977
NORTHWOOD	2,520
PEBBLE CREEK	3,936
PIEDMONT PARK	4,124
TAYLORS	
Tract 0026.04	
Blocks: 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415	954
WADE HAMPTON	1,598
WASHINGTON HEIGHTS	
Tract 0023.04	
Blocks: 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 301, 302, 304, 306, 307, 308, 309	766
WOODLAWN	2,554
DISTRICT TOTAL	27,849
PERCENT VARIATION	-0.957

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area **Population**

Greenville County

Census Voting Tabulation Districts

BATESVILLE 4,777

DEL NORTE

Tract 0018.02

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 111, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127 1,332

Tract 0026.02

Blocks: 604, 605, 608, 609 1,148

Tract 0028.03

Blocks: 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911 ... 678

DEVENGER 4,144

DOVE TREE 2,912

GILDER CREEK

Tract 0028.06

Blocks: 150 276

MEADOWOOD 1,353

MERRIFIELD 1,415

MISSION

Tract 0018.02

Blocks: 901A, 901B, 901C, 902 253

Tract 0028.05

Blocks: 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119 1,243

PLEASANT GROVE

Tract 0025.03

Blocks: 204, 220, 221, 222, 301, 302, 303, 321, 322, 323, 324, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419 653

SC HOUSE DISTRICTS (FEDERAL COURT)

DISTRICT 21

Area **Population**

Tract 0026.05

Blocks: 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 513, 514, 515 1,866

PLINEY

Tract 0028.06

Blocks: 101, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326 2,163

Tract 0030.03

Blocks: 203, 204, 205, 206, 207 326

ROCKY CREEK

Tract 0026.05

Blocks: 930, 931 14

Tract 0028.06

Blocks: 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130 2,175

Tract 0028.07

Blocks: 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209C, 210, 211, 212, 213, 901, 902A, 902B, 902C, 903, 904, 905, 906, 917 1,155

DISTRICT TOTAL 27,883

PERCENT VARIATION ..... -0.836